AM
1936
wit

Withington, A. C.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

MUSIC CRITICISM IN BOSTON 1881 - 1931
as it deals with new conductors,
composers and compositions

by

Anna Cotton Withington

(A.B., Wheaton College, 1933)

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

1936

AM
1936
wit

Topical Outline

Page

I General Introduction: Purpose and methods of thesis 1

II Individual Critics

A. William Foster Apthorp 4
B. Philip Hale 4
C. Olin Downes 4
D. Warren Storey Smith 5
E. Louis Elson 5
F. Henry T. Parker 5
G. Other Critics 6

III Introduction to First Period: Post-Wagnerian (1881 - 1891)

A. Founding of the Orchestra 7
B. Composers of the Period 7

C. Conductors of the Period

1. Georg Henschel 8
2. Wilhelm Gericke 9
3. Arthur Nikisch 10

IV First Period: Post-Wagnerian (1881 - 1891)

A. Brahms 11
B. Wagner 14
C. Saint-Saëns 16

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Boston Library Consortium Member Libraries

https://archive.org/details/musiccriticismin00with

D. Dvorak 18
E. Smetana 19
F. Strauss (Richard) 20
G. Bruckner 21
H. Tschaikowsky 21
I. Borodin 22
J. Lalo 22
K. Foote 23
L. MacDowell 23
M. Chadwick 23

V Introduction to Second Period: Debussyan (1892 - 1909)
A. Composers
  1. Post-Wagnerians 25
  2. Characteristic composers 25
B. Conductors
  1. Arthur Nikisch 26
  2. Emil Paur 26
  3. Karl Muck 26
  4. Max Fiedler 27

VI Second Period: Debussyan (1892 - 1909)
A. Post-Wagnerians
  1. Strauss 28

2. Brahms Memorial Concert 32

3. Tschaikowsky 32

4. Rimsky-Korsakoff 34

5. Glazounoff 35

6. Rachmaninoff 35

7. Bruckner 36

8. Mahler 38

9. Franck 38

10. Saint-Saëns 39

11. Smetana 40

12. Dohnanyi 40

13. Elgar 41

14. Foote 41

15. Chadwick 41

16. Hadley 42

B. Characteristic composers

1. Debussy 42

2. D'Indy 44

3. Dukas 45

4. Bantock 45

5. Loeffler 45

C. Independent

1. Jan Sibelius 46

VII Introduction to Third Period:
Stravinskyan (1910 - 1931)

A. Composers

1. Post-Wagnerians 49
2. Debussyans 49
3. Characteristic composers 49
4. Independent

B. Conductors

1. Max Fiedler 50
2. Dr. Muck 50
3. Pierre Monteux 50
4. Serge Koussevitsky 51

VIII Third Period: Stravinskyan (1910 - 1931)

A. Post-Wagnerians

1. Strauss 53
2. Borodin 53
3. Chadwick 54

B. Debussyans

1. Debussy 55
2. Dukas 57
3. Ravel 57
4. Schmitt 59
5. Albeniz 59
6. Enesco 59
7. Resphigi 60

8. Bantock 62
9. Bax 62
10. Holst 63
11. Delius 63
12. Vaughan Williams 64
13. Loeffler 65
14. Hill 65
15. Griffes 66

C. Characteristic Composers

1. Stravinsky 66
2. Scriabin 69
3. Schönberg 70
4. Prokofieff 71
5. Tcherepnin (Nikolai) 72
6. Milhaud 73
7. Honegger 73
8. Roussel 74
9. Malipiero 75
10. Hindemith 76
11. DeFalla 76
12. Bartók 77
13. Lambert 78
14. Bliss 78
15. Hanson 79
16. Bloch 79

17. Carpenter 80
18. Copland 81
19. Sessions 82
20. Koussevitsky 82
D. Independent
1. Sibelius 82
IX Conclusion
A. Concerning Critics 87
B. Concerning Compositions 91
C. Concerning Conductors 94
X Comprehensive Digest of the Thesis 99

I General Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the attitudes of the music critics of Boston toward new music. The programs of the Boston Symphony Orchestra have been taken as the best source to find the new music of a given period. Although there have been and still are other musical organizations in Boston interested in the presentation of new music, the programs of the Boston Symphony Orchestra are both representative and comprehensive in the production of new music.

I have limited myself to the first fifty years, from 1881 to 1931, for three reasons. First, it is a convenient and practical interval with which to work. Second, it may be divided logically into three distinct divisions. And third, the fiftieth year was completed not very long before the death of two of Boston's chief music critics, Philip Hale and Henry T. Parker.

The three divisions into which I have divided this span of fifty years are as follows: first, the post-Wagnerian period, which covers the years from 1881 to 1891 and is so named because the influence of Wagner was predominant at that time; second, the Debussyan period, which begins in 1892, the year which marks the beginning of this composer's maturity with the composition of the

Prélude à l'Aprés midi d'un Faune, and extends to 1909; third, the Stravinskyan period, which ranges from 1910, the year in which Stravinsky came into prominence with the production of The Firebird, to the year 1931, the last one with which this thesis is concerned.

It is only natural to find, in looking back over this period of fifty years, many compositions which have not stood the test of time and have not been accepted as part of any standard symphonic repertory. After considering every program given by the orchestra, I have selected, for the most part, only those compositions which have been generally accepted as worthy examples of symphonic literature. Because, however, I am dealing with Boston music critics and with the Boston Symphony Orchestra I have included in my discussion several composers of local interest, some of whom have also achieved national and even international fame.

It is often impossible to assign anycomposer exclusively to any one period because his works often extend from one period into the next. For this reason and in order to be as accurate as possible I have chosen to discuss the compositions by grouping them to-gether according to composers within any period to which they belong. Thus the development of a composer's style may be more easily traced. As a further aid in ascertaining this development of style I have, in many places, inserted the date of composition or

publication of a new work in order to determine the relative newness of the novelties presented to Boston.

In cases where I have stated only one critic's reactions to a new composition or composer, the reason was that that one opinion was, on the whole, representative of the general trend of comment. Where there has been definite controversy I have tried to state both sides of the question in order to present as diversified a set of reactions as possible.

II Discussion of Individual Critics

When the Boston Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1881, Mr. William Foster Apthorp was the principal music critic in Boston. He had attended Harvard, had studied musical theory under John Knowles Paine, and had graduated with the class of 1869. After a brief service on the staffs of other newspapers, he became, in 1881, the music critic of the Boston Transcript and he retained this post until he retired in 1903.[1] He also edited the program notes of the Boston Symphony Orchestra from 1892 to 1901.

The noted Philip Hale graduated from Yale in 1876, was admitted to the New York bar in 1880, and studied music in Europe from 1882 until 1887. In 1889 he came to live in Boston where he wrote for the Boston Post and the Boston Home Journal until 1891. Then he wrote for the Boston Journal until 1903 when he joined the staff of the Boston Herald, remaining with that paper until his death in 1934. He edited the program notes of the Boston Symphony Orchestra for many years, from 1901 until 1933 and acquired a great reputation as an authority on music.[2]

Olin Downes received his musical education from several men. He studied piano, music history, and

---

[1] Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians Vol. I p. 104

[2] Ibid. Vol. II pp. 495 - 496

analysis with Dr. Louis Kelterborn; harmony with Homer Norris and Clifford C. Heilman; and harmony and music appreciation with John P.Marshall. He was the music critic for the Boston Post from 1906 to 1924. Since 1924 he has been with the New York Times.[1]

When Mr. Downes left the Boston Post in 1924 his place was taken by Warren Storey Smith. Mr. Smith studied at the Faelten Pianoforte School from which he graduated in 1908. He was a member of the faculty of that school from 1908 to 1919. In 1919 he became assistant music critic of the Boston Transcript and he remained with that paper until 1924 when he became music editor on the Boston Post. Since 1922 he has also been a member of the faculty of the New England Conservatory of Music.[2]

Mr. Louis C. Elson studied singing in Boston and theory in Leipzig. He served on the staffs of several Boston journals, joining that of the Boston Advertiser in 1888, on which paper he remained until his death in 1920. He was also head of the theory department of the New England Conservatory of Music from 1882 until 1920 and, during his lifetime, wrote numerous books and articles on music.[3]

Mr. Henry T.Parker attended Harvard University

---

[1] Who's Who in America 1934 - 1935 p. 743

[2] Ibid. 1934 - 1935 pp. 2206 - 2207

[3] Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians Vol. II p. 159

from 1886 to 1889. He then studied in Europe until 1891. From 1892 until 1898 and from 1901 until 1903 he was the New York correspondent for the Boston Transcript. He was the London correspondent for the Boston Transcript and the New York Commercial Advertiser between 1898 and 1900. Then he became associated with the staff of the New York Globe where he was dramatic critic in 1903 - 1904 and dramatic and music critic in 1904 - 1905. From 1905 until his death in 1934 he was dramatic and music critic for the Boston Transcript.[1]

Other critics, whose names appear only once or twice throughout the thesis, are: Mr. Warren Davenport of the Boston Traveler, Mr. Howard Ticknor of the Courier, Mr. Arthur Elson who substituted occasionally for his father, Mr. Louis C.Elson, on the Boston Advertiser, Mr. W.D.Quint of the Boston Traveler, Mr. Roy R.Gardner of the Boston Transcript and later of the Boston Herald, Mr. Penfield Roberts of the Boston Globe, and Stuart Mason of the Christian Science Monitor.

Very often the reviews were unsigned and in such cases it was possible to mention only the name of the paper, such as the Boston Journal, the Boston Herald, the Gazette, the Boston Globe, etc.

[1] Who's Who in America 1932 - 1933 p. 1786

III Introduction to First Period 1881 - 1891

This survey of Music Criticism in Boston begins in the year 1881, the year of the founding of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Previously the most important orchestral concerts were those of the Harvard Musical Association. It was a guest conductor of this organization, Mr. Georg Henschel, who became the first conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Mr. Henry Lee Higginson founded and sustained the orchestra for thirty-seven years. The announcement of Mr. Higginson's project appeared on March 30th, 1881, in the Boston newspapers, and the first concert took place on October 22nd, 1881.[1]

At the beginning of this first period the life of Wagner was nearly over - he died in 1883. His influence, however, dominates these ten years and we see this influence especially in the works of Bruckner, Mahler, and Richard Strauss. One of the most outstanding figures at this time was the great German, Johannes Brahms. Another noteworthy composer who belongs to this period, although none of his works were played by the Boston Symphony Orchestra during these years, was the French César Franck, who died in 1880. There was also a second Frenchman, Camille

---

[1] Howe, M.A. The Boston Symphony Orchestra 1881 - 1931 pp. 16 - 26

Saint-Saëns, several of whose works were being introduced to Boston at this time. Smetana, and later Dvorak, the latter being the more important of the two, represented Bohemia and were exponents of national music. In Russia there were the Nationalists Balakirev, Borodin, Cui, Moussorgsky, and Rimsky-Korsakoff, who called themselves "The Great Five", as well as the more cosmopolitan Tschaikowsky, who was perhaps the most outstanding Russian composer.

It was these men and others influenced by them who show the trend of music during this period. Their work also extends into the second, or Debussyan period, indeed even somewhat into the last, or Stravinskyan, period.

The first conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra was Mr. Georg Henschel who held the position from 1881 until 1884. His conducting of the Harvard Musical Association concert on March 3rd, 1881, led to his appointment as conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. In the early fall of 1881 there were many speculations expressed in various Boston newspapers. The Boston Transcript of September 9th, for example, remarked that "every programme will embody a virtually new and individual musical idea. What he gives will be his own." Previously, on April 6th of the same year, the Home Journal observed that "as a pianist and composer Mr. Henschel shone far more brightly than as a singer, while as conductor he has yet to make

his reputation."

As time went on there was a great deal of argument for and against Mr. Henschel. For instance, the question of 'tempo' soon became a chief ground for adverse criticism.[1] Many were skeptical of Henschel's lack of experience and some, as Louis Elson remarked of the initial concert of October 22nd, felt there was "a good deal of Henschel in the programme."[2] Nevertheless Henschel did a great deal in laying the foundation for the great orchestra of the future and his untiring efforts did much to put the orchestra securely on its feet.

In 1884 Henschel was succeeded by Wilhelm Gericke, who held the post for five years, until 1889. He was forced to decline a reingagement in 1889 because of ill health. Unlike Henschel, Mr. Gericke was an experienced conductor as well as a capable organizer.[3] One Herald article stated that Gericke's talent was of such a positive nature that it commanded instant recognition and the Journal once said that "Gericke's strength lies in the fact that he has the power to inspire the musicians and to make them understand that they must not be an expressive artist nor yet a mechanical machine.[4]

---

[1] Howe, M.A. The Boston Symphony Orchestra 1881 - 1931 p. 35

[2] Ibid. p. 37

[3] Ibid. p. 104

[4] Boston Journal (date unobtainable)

When Gericke accepted a reappointment as conductor of this orchestra in 1898, the orchestra's great efficiency was "largely due to his indefatigability and skill as a drill master, his conscientious devotion to a high ideal, and his remarkable sense of euphony and tonal balance." [1]

In 1889 Arthur Nikisch accepted the post of conductor, to remain with the organization until 1893, two years after the close of the post-Wagnerian period. There was great controversy over the choice of Nikisch because of the contract labor law. But Mr. Nikisch came, nevertheless. Five representative musicians (Carl Zerrahn, Mr. John K.Paine, George L.Osgood, Bernard Listemann, and Mr.B.J.Lang) were invited to state their opinions of the new conductor after his first concert. This they did and agreed unanimously that Mr. Nikisch was indeed a wise choice. As Mr. Osgood said, "Mr. Nikisch plays upon his orchestra as a genius would play upon his chosen instrument." The Transcript spoke of his absolute command of the orchestra and described Nikisch as "a true conductor to his finger tips."

---

[1] Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians Vol. II p. 369

IV First Period 1881 - 1891

The first conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, Mr. Georg Henschel, was a devoted admirer of Brahms and did much to establish the music of this composer at an early date.

The Tragic Overture was the first important work presented for the first time in Boston [1] on Oct. 28th, 1881. This work was composed in 1880. The composition was spoken of as a rich and noble work by the majority of critics. It is interesting to note that the Transcript reserved its judgment until after the repetition of the overture at the concert on Nov, 5th - and then called it "one of the most satisfactory works of the composer."

On Feb. 10th, 1882, a still earlier work, the Rhapsody, Opus 53,(1870) , was given. The general opinion was that it was a vague, indefinite work but the repetition on Feb. 17th was apparently very welcome and a justifiable reappearance. It has only been heard twice, however, since its initial performance which proves that the judgment of the critics has been sustained.

---

[1] Note: All but a few of the works treated in this thesis are first performances in Boston, in the United States,or in America. Since the majority of compositions are those which appear in Boston for the first time, I shall omit this phrase throughout the remainder of the thesis. In regard to first performances in the United States or in America I shall take notice of them as they appear in the discussion.

The Second Symphony was very coldly received on Feb. 24th, 1882, because of the "wearisome effect of constant iteration and because the thematic development was pushed to an extreme point." [1] This work was composed in 1877, five years before its appearance in Boston.

On Nov. 17th, 1822, the Academic Festival Overture (1880) was played by the orchestra. It was generally held to be not one of Brahms' greatest works and "does not improve materially on closer acquaintance." [2]

The last novelty presented by Mr. Henschel was the Brahms Piano Concerto in B Flat Major (1882) which was heard on March 15th, 1884. It was unanimously acclaimed by the critics as a "strikingly beautiful work," [3] "the most enjoyable work of Brahms yet put before the public", [4] and as a composition "on a plane of lofty musical thought." [5]

Wilhelm Gericke, who succeeded Mr. Henschel, first presented as a new composition the Third Symphony (1883) on Nov. 7th, 1884. The Herald criticized the "valueless character of a brilliant result" but the rest of the critics spoke of it as "unmistakably characteristic of Brahms" and "in every way a worthy companion to its two predecessors." [6]

[1] Boston Transcript W.F.Apthorp Feb. 26, 1882

[2] Boston Advertiser Nov. 18, 1882

[3] Boston Journal

[4] Boston Herald

[5] Boston Transcript W.F.Apthorp

[6] Ibid. Nov. 8, 1884

About a month later, on Dec. 5th, 1884, the orchestra performed the Variations on a Theme by Haydn (1874). There was some disagreement about the merits of this work. The Transcript called it "stupendous ... here Brahms proclaims his individuality" but the conservative Home Journal asked, "Why was it ever composed? Mention the name of Brahms and infer its thoroughly ungenial character."

The Fourth Symphony in E Minor (1886) was enthusiastically received on Nov. 26th, 1886. It was said to be emphatically the "greatest since the First Symphony in C Minor "[1] and "the most noteworthy of the composer's efforts in that field."[2] "Confused and wearying effects" was the point made by the Globe but, on the other side, although calling it an unequal work, the Post thought it a deeply interesting and profound work.

The ninth and last new work by Brahms to be performed during this period was the Violin Concerto (1879), given on Dec. 6th, 1889. The Herald believed that "it does not add to the reputation of its composer, save in the intricacies it affords the solo instrument, but it gained hearty commendation from the audience mainly by reason of Mr. Franz Kneisel's performance." Mr. Downes[3] acknowledged the beauty of the first movement but called the other two

---

[1] Boston Transcript Nov. 27, 1886

[2] Gazette

[3] of the Boston Post

distinctly dull. For the Traveler it was "another beautiful work by Brahms" and to the Globe it was a "delightful composition."

Thus it may be seen that four of Brahms' new works proved acceptable to the majority of critics, three were promptly turned down and two provoked a wide variety of opinion. Mr. W.F.Apthorp once wrote that "It took considerably longer than this (i.e. six years) for Brahms to win anything like a firm foothold in Boston .... When Brahms came, he seemed the hardest nut to crack of all ... The public persistently cried for new things, and turned up its nose when it got them. "[1]

As to Wagner, some thirty overtures or excerpts from the different operas were played at various concerts during this period. None of them, however, were new to Boston. The period did introduce three items new to Boston: first, two performances on the afternoon of Nov. 10th, 1882, of the Prelude to Parsifal. The Globe described it as "Wagner at his best" but it was generally called less interesting, less original, than other preludes by Wagner and the Home Journal remarked that a second hearing did not help much.

Second was the Good Friday Spell from Parsifal, given on Feb. 15th, 1884. Only the Globe criticized it adversely by saying that "it awakened no more than a

[1] Howe, M.A. The Boston Symphony Orchestra 1881 - 1931 p. 49

languid interest. " Five other critics (of the Advertiser, the Herald, the Journal, the Gazette, and the Transcript) agreed that it was "one of the most serenely beautiful, well-nigh ecstatic pieces of writing that we have yet heard from Wagner's pen. " [1] And the Herald noted that "an almost breathless silence attended its performance."

Third, the Symphony in C Major was given its first performance in America by the Boston Symphony Orchestra on Feb. 24th, 1888. The prevailing opinion was that this was a composition which was not so important but the fact that it was tolerated was probably due to Wagner's being the composer and all agreed that it was of very slight musical value.

In passing it may be well to speak of the Wagner Memorial concert on Feb. 16th, 1883. It must have been a very solemn occasion but also, to quote the Gazette, "The necessity for the performance of the programme gave one more cause for regret at the composer's death. The whole concert was an elegiac nightmare ... a long stretch of cacophonous dreariness."

As in the case of Brahms the opinions of the critics varied about Wagner. The Prelude to Parsifal and the Symphony in C Major were generally felt to be inferior to other works of this composer but the

---

[1] Boston Transcript W.F.Apthorp

Good Friday Spell from Parsifal received hearty acclamation. It is interesting to note that the Prelude is heard to-day as much if not more than the Good Friday Spell.

Saint-Saëns was first represented at these concerts by two dances (Danse des Prêtresses and Bacchanale) from Samson et Dalila on March 2nd, 1883. The Herald called them "charming novelties" and the Gazette spoke of originality in themes and treatment and the beauty and finish of the orchestration.

On Dec. 14th, 1883, another work by Saint-Saëns, the Introduction and Rondo Capricioso, Opus 28, for violin and orchestra, was first heard. Most of the critics discussed the soloist, Monsieur de Sève, rather than the composition itself. The Home Journal, however, spoke of it as one of the most interesting works of its class.

His Danse Macabre appeared on the program of Feb. 13th, 1885. It was played not once, but twice. According to the Herald's criticism the second hearing gave even more cause for enjoyment than the first, but the Advertiser hoped that this repetition was for the first and last time - too wild, weird, and fantastic. In spite of the fact that this number has been performed only three times since its first appearance it has become a 'best seller' at the Pop concerts.

The Rhapsodie d'Auvergne, for piano and orchestra, was heard on Jan. 1st, 1886. Generally agreed that

it was a "brilliant and fascinating fantasy",[1] it was said by the *Gazette* critic that it was "not a particularly interesting work ... and the subjects greatly lack originality." Incidentally this work has never been repeated by the orchestra at its regular concerts so we may infer that the critic of the *Gazette* was justified in making such a statement.

The fifth and last new composition by this composer to be played during this era was the *Violin Concerto*, Opus 61, No. 3, on Jan. 3rd, 1890. Mr. Hale[2] criticized the accompaniment by the orchestra but said the Concerto "abounds in pleasing melodies and is a grateful composition for the soloist although it cannot be placed among the best works of this composer." It has, however, been given eight performances since that time which showsxthat it has by no means been discarded.

Controversy over the works of Saint-Saëns did not rage as furiously among the critics as it did over those of Wagner and Brahms but there was still a variety of opinion expressed. Two compositions were acknowledged to be excellent, two were debarred from any list of his best works, and one, the *Danse Macabre*, was both liked and

---

[1] *Boston Transcript* W.F.Apthorp

[2] in the *Home Journal*

disliked. Saint-Saëns' influence was strong at this time but whether more than a very few of the works cited above are really important leaves room for speculation.

A work about which the critics did not agree was Dvorak's Symphony in D Major, Opus 60, (1880), and presented by the Boston Symphony Orchestra on Oct. 26th, 1883. It was repeated on the following Dec. 8th. Both times it was caustically denounced by the Herald critic but the Transcript, Gazette, and Globe agreed that it was a most satisfying work, one which "would amply repay careful study." [1] Its only repetitions were in 1883 (that of Dec. 8th), 1886 and 1890. It is rarely heard anywhere to-day.

At the beginning of the season of 1886 - 1887 Mr. Gericke presented the first of several new works by this same composer. This was the Second Symphony in D Minor (1885), which was given in Boston on Oct. 2nd, 1886. The Post described it as a marked success in every way and the Herald considered it worthy of a second hearing. The Transcript, on the other hand, although calling it an effective work, felt that "it does not inspire one with perfect faith in its lasting power." [2] This work has proved more lasting than the first one, certainly, for it has received eight repetitions, the last one being in 1923.

[1] Boston Transcript W.F.Apthorp

[2] Ibid. Oct. 3rd, 1886

The other two compositions played during this season were: the Legends, Opus 59, on Nov. 5th, 1886, described as enjoyable but not at all profound[1] and seċondly, a Rhapsody, on Nov. 26th, which was fresh and interesting to the critic of the Post and spoken of as a brilliant piece of writing according to the Transcript review.

The last new composition presented in this post-Wagnerian period was the Symphony No. 4 in G Major (1884) which was heard for the first time in America on Feb. 26th, 1892. Mr. Hale noted a few pleasing themes but felt that this symphony would not add to the fame of its composer.

On the whole these five works did not make a great impression on the critics although most of the music seemed enjoyable at the time. They are also works which are seldom heard to-day.

Only two works of Smetana, the less illustrious forerunner of Dvorak, appeared on the programs between 1881 and 1891. First was the Overture to The Bartered Bride (1866) which was given in Boston on Dec. 30th, 1887. Although this composition is not of so great importance, it is a very popular and likable work. Most of the critics made due note of this fact.

[1] Boston Globe

The second work to be heard was Vltava(1874) played on Nov. 21st, 1890. The Post's critic called it pleasant if not great and the Transcript considered it a very enjoyable and even fascinating in the earlier portions.

Richard Strauss was first heard at the Symphony concerts on Dec. 21st, 1888, when his Symphonic Fantasie, In Italy, (1886), was performed. The influence of Wagner was noted by the Post, the newness and strangeness of the music by the Globe, but the Advertiser called it too abstruse in every part and pleasing neither to audience nor critic.

On Oct. 30th, 1891, this composer's Don Juan(1880) was heard. Mr. Hale said that Strauss had little invention and his musical thoughts were of little worth. He also commented upon the apparent abscence of genuine passion or terror. The orchestration was somewhat original, somewhat brilliant, and somewhat borrowed. The Globe spoke of it as a strong work but on the whole not of even excellence.

At this time there seemed to be a lack of understanding and a feeling of strangeness which dominated the critics' opinions about the music of Strauss. And it was only natural that they should find it difficult and hard to judge after hearing only one or two examples of his work.

The only new composition by Bruckner to be produced during these ten years was his Seventh Symphony (1884) which was performed on Feb. 4th, 1887. This was apparently not well liked in Boston. The Traveler critic remarked that it was hard to understand, but an important contribution. The Transcript's review described it as ugly, tedious, badly constructed music. And the Herald said it was "little more than a clever adaptation of the musical forms and methods of orchestration found in Wagner, Beethoven, and Saint-Saëns." This symphony was given five repetitions up to 1915 and was then laid on the shelf until Dr. Koussevitsky revived it on March 6th, 1936.

The first important new work by Tschaikowsky to be introduced at these concerts was the Serenade for Strings which appeared on the program of Oct. 12th, 1888. This was described as a "fresh and pleasing work" by the Gazette and the Post spoke of it as a composition which has "varied and solid merit."

Secondly, we find his Romeo and Juliet Overture (1870) on the program of Feb. 7th, 1890. The Home Journal described it as an inspiration of genius and also said that "no words can describe the sombre and tender beauties of this masterpiece." Although the Herald called it a masterly work it was felt that the outline of the picture was indistinct but the Globe considered it a "most welcome

addition to the symphony orchestra's repertory as highly descriptive music."

And then, on Oct. 17th, 1890, the Andantino and Scherzo from his Fourth Symphony (1878) were produced. The Traveler critic thought that it was exceedingly well written but the thought itself did not transcend the commonplace. On the other hand, the Home Journal wished that the entire Symphony might have been heard -these two movements being beautiful in idea and workmanship and ingenious as regards orchestration.

There was, as may be seen from the foregoing paragraphs, a generally favorable reception of Tschaikowsky's music although of course there were one or two who expressed dissatisfaction.

Borodin's Symphony No. I (1867) was heard for the first time in America on Jan. 3rd, 1890. It was hardly fair to judge after a single hearing, according to Mr. Hale, but he felt that it was "too strongly and earnestly written to be contemptuously passed by."

On Nov. 11th, 1887, the Symphonie Espagnole (1885) by Lalo was performed. On the whole it made a very favorable impression - an "exceedingly brilliant work" according to the Transcript and, for the Post, containing "so much good that we can find little fault."

The first new American composition to be played by the orchestra was Arthur Foote's Suite for String Orchestra, Opus 21, (1886), on Nov. 22nd, 1889. The Transcript called it a worthy successor to his first suite and the Herald noted that the opus number indicated that there were other works by this composer which should be heard in the future.

On Jan. 10th, 1890, MacDowell's Lancelot and Elaine (1884) was produced for the first time in America. The Post observed that it was interesting but with all too evident shortcomings. The Herald, however, spoke of it as a work which shows new evidence of the largeness and breadth of MacDowell's musical nature.

Another work by this composer, the Suite in A Minor, was performed on Oct. 23rd, 1891. The Globe definitely stated that "as a series of tone pictures the suite is certainly entitled to high rank." Mr. Hale [1] remarked that "MacDowell has a voice of his own - his melodies are fresh, his harmonies often exquisite, often striking, and his command of the resources of the orchestra sure."

The last new composition to be considered in this period is a Pastoral Prelude by Chadwick, which was played on Jan. 30th, 1892, one year after its composition.

[1] in the Boston Post

Mr. Louis Elson called it a disappointment -the themes were vague and the instrumentation pale. The Transcript, however, described it as "bright, cleverly written, and charming in effect." Mr. Warren Davenport [1] spoke of it as ingenious, showing the knowledge and skill of the writer in dealing with orchestral effects.

---

[1] in the Boston Traveler

V Introduction to Second Period 1892 - 1909

With the advent of the Debussyan period there was a definite change in the development of music. This change was revolutionary rather than evolutionary because the music of Debussy and those following him could not be analyzed by the same harmonic system used for the analysis of music by Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, etc.

There were many post-Wagnerians who continued in this period, such as Strauss, Tschaikowsky, Rimsky-Korsakoff, Glazounoff, Rachmaninoff, Bruckner, Mahler, Franck, Saint-Saëns, Smetana, Dohnanyi, Elgar, Foote, Chadwick, and Hadley.

In all countries we find new figures coming into prominence at this time and simply to list the different names gives one a good idea of what was then going on.

France, in addition to Debussy, could boast of D'Indy, Dukas, Schmitt, and Ravel. Resphigi represented Italy and Albeniz hailed from Spain. Enesco was a Roumanian and Sibelius was the sole representative of Finland.

In England there were Delius, Vaughan Williams, Holst, Bantock, Ireland, and Bax; in America, Hill, Griffes, Loeffler, and Taylor.

During these seventeen years (1892 - 1909)

there were five different conductors of the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

Arthur Nikisch, whose term began in 1889, continued until 1893. At the end of the season of 1892 - 1893 Mr. Nikisch resigned and for the following season Mr. Emil Paur was engaged. The general opinion of his conducting of the first concert was very favorable. According to Mr. Warren Davenport he made a "most satisfactory beginning - modest and earnest in his bearing .... " Mr. Howard Ticknor[1] spoke of his intelligence, decision, and finesse as far outweighing any "lack of Delsatian curves or statuesque attitude."

Upon the retirement of Emil Paur, Mr. Wilhelm Gericke returned, in the fall of 1898, to conduct once again the Boston Symphony Orchestra. He was exceedingly glad to get back to Boston which he considered his second home. And to all appearances the patrons of these concerts gave him a sincere and hearty welcome.

In the fall of 1906, Dr. Karl Muck became the conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra upon the retirement of Mr. Gericke. His dignified, sincere personality proved to be the chief feature of his first performance, according to Mr. Philip Hale.[2] Mr. Henry T. Parker[3]

[1] of the Courier

[2] of the Boston Herald

[3] of the Boston Transcript

emphasized his quiet composure on the podium and spoke of his keen and searching sense of musical design. The Globe critic described him as one of the best-trained, most scholarly expositors of music, a skillful player on the many voices of the orchestra.

Mr. Max Fiedler replaced Dr. Muck in the fall of 1908. To the Globe critic he was "forceful but never grotesque" in his conducting of the first concert. He directed without score and was calm, dispassionate when delivering the message of the composer, but the personification of animation when gigantic themes and emotions were to be depicted. To Mr. Olin Downes he was enthusiastic in gestures, of much nervous force, and far less formal than Dr. Muck. And Mr. Louis Elson spoke thus: "Mr. Fiedler is more than satisfactory ; he is to be a worthy figure in the famous list of great conductors who have led our Symphony Orchestra."

VI Second Period 1892 - 1909

The first new composition to be considered in this Debussyan period is Strauss' Symphony in F Minor. This was performed on Nov. 3rd, 1893, during Mr. Emil Paur's first season with the orchestra. Admitted that it is an early work Mr. Hale found much to praise about it and desired to hear it again. Mr. Arthur Elson, son of the critic Louis Elson and substituting for his father on the Boston Advertiser called it very enjoyable as a whole in spite of its length and Mr. Davenport spoke of its originality and wonderful resources. This symphony is very seldom heard to-day and has been repeated only once by the orchestra, in 1900.

On Feb. 21st, 1896, another work by this composer was produced - Till Eulenspiegel's lustige Streiche (1895). Mr. Louis Elson called it a great exhibition of skill in scoring but "the joke of the third movement of Beethoven's Pastoral Symphony was a good deal better than any of the humor displayed by that Wagnerian chromo -Strauss." The Herald critic pronounced it unfathomable after one hearing and spoke of the relief felt when the next number began. We also quote the Transcript - "as for beauty of form and coloring, for refined delicacy of humor, this

jocular composition is about on a par with the ordinary one cent valentine of commerce." This work, however, has become a great favorite and has been heard at least thirteen times since its first performance. It is at present generally considered to be the finest of Strauss' tone poems.

Another tone poem, Tod und Verklärung, (1889) was played on Feb. 5th, 1897. The Transcript critic called it an 'unholy terror' and yet "Strauss has something really great and grand in his mind and shows, moreover, a certain vague inkling of how to say it grandly. But Strauss is not Wagner gone mad, but an unbalanced mystic crazed by trying to turn Wagner into Liszt." But Mr. Hale, in the Journal, called it one of the most remarkable works that Mr. Paur has produced here ..."and they do him wrong who say that Strauss is a mere imitator of Wagner. He has his own voice, a gigantic one, and his own vocabulary." To Mr. Ticknor, however, it was "bombast and rodomontade and the orchestra played it for more than it was worth." According to Mr. Elson, "it was gloriously scored, some of its thoughts are impressive in a high degree and it even contains some short bits of absolute melodic beauty."

Also Sprach Zarathustra was given on Oct. 29th, 1897, one year after its publication. Mr. Elson called it "the most disagreeable number of the concert because it showed a great composer, a genius, gone in a false direction,

lending his vast powers to push modern music still further into the brambles ... And the work has difficulties almost beyond conception." Mr. W.D.Quint said the general effect is that of a fierce uproar and a fiendishly ingenious cacophony that at last becomes an incentive to laughter. But Mr. Hale felt that this was a "stupendous work, one that should be heard again, and soon. For surely, if this music is madness, it is the madness of a master." It did not then appeal to Mr. Apthorp but he felt drawn to it in spite of himself and in spite of the fact that "it reminds one of things one has tried to escape from in nightmares."

Boston heard Ein Heldenleben (1899) on Dec. 6th, 1901. In spite of new orchestral effects, Mr. Apthorp felt that Strauss has "done harm to our art by trying to force it beyond its limits .... it is but right that our public should hear it once or even twice, for it is the 'ultima thule' of modern orchestration." Mr. Hale said in part: "It was a pleasure to see that the audience recognized the strength, beauty, grandeur of the work, of the composer's conception, the labor of the conductor and orchestra, and the high character of the performance."

Another new work, Don Quixote, Opus 35, (1898) was heard on Feb. 12th, 1904. Mr. Elson, although taking stock of its good points, called it "an extraordinarily trying work." But Mr. Hale considered it "exceedingly,

enormously ingenious - ingenuity is the distinguishing feature of the composition, but ingenuity is not the chief characteristic of the purest and noblest art." Also in another article Mr. Hale wrote," But it is the only one of his more important works that is, for the most part, ineffective and dull." Like Ein Heldenleben, Don Quixote had only five repetitions during the first fifty years of concerts by the orchestra.

On Feb. 15th, 1907, the Symphonia Domestica, Opus 53, (1904) was produced. Two impressions were important to Mr. Parker. One was of beauty and imaginative power of much of the music; the other was of the humanity of it all. To Mr. Elson, the subject itself was outside the realms of art and he says in his review, "We think this work and Ein Heldenleben, too, only a temporary phase in music." As for Mr. Hale - for him the entire work was too long drawn out; the very ingenuity, the diabolical cleverness become wearisome. But he also says that a single performance is unfair to the composer, conductor, the orchestra, and the audience. This work has been heard eight times since its initial performance in 1907.

The feeling of strangeness and lack of understanding, which dominated the critics' opinions about the music of Strauss in the post-Wagnerian period, changed, during the next seventeen years, to frank dismay and disgust,

although these men would admit the technical genius of the composer. Of all the critics Mr. Hale seemed to be the one most favorably impressed by Strauss' new works although he did not hesitate to say that he found much that was disagreeable in the music.

Although this does not come under the heading of new music, it might be well to mention here the concert of April 10th, 1897, in memory of Johannes Brahms, who died on April 3rd, 1897. It simply goes to show how the general attitude toward this composer changed from the time when his works were first played in Boston and even such a memorial, as Mr. Elson said, was "scantiest justice to the evolution of his genius."

The first appearance of Tschaikowsky in this period was on Oct. 21st, 1892, when his Fifth Symphony in E Minor (1887) was performed. The Transcript found it immensely long and elaborate - vigorous instrumentation but tending too often to coarseness. Mr. Hale felt that it did not add much to Tschaikowsky's reputation but that it did have a great deal of real Russian color, thus having both merits and faults.

The first novelty of Mr. Paur's second season was presented on Dec. 28th, 1894. This was the same composer's Sixth Symphony (1893). Mr. Hale stated that "this noble work of Tschaikowsky made a profound impression." Mr. Davenport noted especially the inadequate performance by the orchestra - apparently lack of rehearsal - but desired a

a repetition of the work as soon as possible. When it was repeated, on Jan. 10th, 1896, the Transcript called it "a work of genius from beginning to end."

His next work to be mentioned is the fantasia for orchestra, Francesca da Rimini, (1876), played on Nov. 1st, 1895. According to Mr. Elson, Tschaikowsky here outdid Berlioz in the portrayal of horror - there were moments of genius and a mastery of the orchestra was constantly exhibited. He also said that it was weird and strong, a composition to test the endurance of the orchestra. Mr. Hale found it inferior to either the Hamlet or the Romeo and Juliet and yet admitted that it had its great moments. One of the chief faults seemed to be that it was not firmly knit.

The complete Fourth Symphony was given on Nov. 27th, 1896. Mr. Hale observed that "it was a work of unusual interest. It has elemental qualities and much inspiration throughout. Also a wealth of ingenuity in the detail." The Herald described it as "an extraordinary work in its bold originality, its barbaric emphasis, and the astonishing brilliancy of its orchestration."

On Oct. 22nd, 1897, the Capriccio Italien was first heard in Boston. This, according to the Globe, is a characteristic composition filled with musical surprises and strange harmonic combinations .... It lacks buoyancy and the jollity one expects of it. To the critic of the Herald it is a singular work, thoroughly but vulgarly Italian in the character of its themes. The only occasions when this work was repeated were in

1899 and 1904 which shows that it is considered one of the less important compositions of this musician.

The general opinions concerning Tschaikowsky's music presented during this period were more diversified than those of the previous era. Then there seemed to be mostly satisfaction and approval. Now approval was given of three items and disapproval of two -these two being the Francesca da Rimini and the Capriccio Italien. Disapproval is still the prevailing feeling concerning these latter works.

Rimsky-Korsakoff's first work to be played in this period was Scheherazade, Opus 35, (1888), on April 16th, 1897. Mr. Elson stated that "It presents few ideas but an overwhelming glow of color." To the Herald critic "the music suggested a parvenu making an ostentatious display of his newly acquired wealth by surrounding himself with gorgeously inharmonious furniture and wearing an excess of diamonds, in the belief that they will obliterate all indications of his innate vulgarity." This work has become very popular and has been given eleven times since 1897 by the orchestra.

On Oct. 22nd, 1897, there was presented his Overture on Themes of the Russian Church, Opus 36, (1888). Mr. Elson described it as altogether a thing of shreds and patches, bizarre and striking, but not in any way beautiful. The Herald critic noted that "the themes in themselves are dry, harsh, and formal, the worth of the work lying wholly in the orchestration which is rich, massive, and brilliant and abounding in fire."

Third and last, on Feb. 4th, 1908, the Capriccio Espagnole, Opus 34, (1887), was played. Mr. Elson was not so impressed, calling it a mere "glorification of the dance". Mr. Parker considered it anything but conventional - "he has mixed his instrumental palette with the highest and keenest orchestral tints." The Globe spoke of the masterly instrumentation and called the performance a real event in the season.

The views expressed concerning these three works by Rimsky-Korsakoff were divided in each case but they are numbers which have become more popular in later years - Scheherazade has had eleven further performances, the Overture five, and the Capriccio Espagnole seven.

Glazounoff's Symphony No. 6 in C Minor (1897) was performed on Oct. 20th, 1899. It was described by Mr. Elson as a "work of normal length, clear shape, splendid development, and while giving a great deal of counterpoint, makes no ostentatious parade of learning." Mr. Hale spoke of the brilliant performance but queried whether a second hearing would deepen or lessen the impression it made. Mr. Apthorp called it eminently worth playing and hearing, but beyond this, the impression it made was exceedingly vague.

When Rachmaninoff conducted the Boston Symphony Orchestra on Dec. 17th, 1909, he played his Second Piano Concerto, Opus 18. "Here", according to Mr. Downes, "Rachmaninoff has written music which gives the solo instrument an individual scheme of beautiful color and design in the pattern of the work,

until it proves too restricted for the breadth of thought which he would express." And also "he invariably has something to say and his sincerity of workmanship may be that which gives his works the remarkable eveness of worth." Mr. Hale, on the other hand, says definitely, "While the concerto is neither cheap nor vulgar, it is not, on the whole, a work of high distinction; but, when played as it was yesterday by the composer, it will interest, please, and provoke applause."

The first new composition performed after the return of Mr. Gericke in the fall of 1898 was Bruckner's Romantic Symphony, which was played on Feb. 10th, 1899. The Herald remarked that it left one somewhat unsatisfied with it as a whole but that it requires more than one hearing to obtain a clear understanding of it. Incidentally, this work was composed in 1881. Mr. Elson described it as of overwhelming length, earnestness and abstruseness, with scarcely a trace of inspiration. The Transcript called the first three movements interesting and impressive but could find nothing in the last movement. Mr. Hale also declared that the final movement was the only one which disappointed him, because of a seeming abscence of cohesion and logical development. This was the only performance of the work between 1899 and 1931.

On Dec. 27th, 1901, this composer's Fifth Symphony in B Flat Major (1894) was presented. Mr. Apthorp wrote that "the themes are of distinguished beauty, the working out is always original and often beautiful; the instrumentation while never

calling attention to itself either by its beauty or its ugliness, gives one the feeling that not for a moment would anything else do. There is, back of all this, a tremendous power." Mr. Hale felt that Boston does not hear such music nearly often enough and yet he says: "To me Bruckner is dullest in this symphony." But he also calls it "a strange symphony, but a gigantic one, one that should not be put away for a dozen years. No doubt twenty years from now the work will seem logically simple." Mr. Elson felt that this work was "worth hearing and is worth studying, yet falls short of greatness and is chiefly interesting as a phase of modern development in music." Mr. Hale's desire to have this symphony played again within a dozen years was not fulfilled - the performance of Dec. 27th, 1901, was the only one in this fifty-year period.

The Eighth Symphony in C Minor (1892) was performed for the first time in America on March 12th, 1909. Mr. Elson called it "a work of great power as well as length and, in spite of its defects and prolixity, it has dignity and power and the voice is thevoice of Bruckner... it is the best of the nine symphonies of this master." Mr. Downes wrote that the "eighth symphony takes the breath away at first by its enormous energy and concentrated force." Mr. Hale distinctly believed it to be Bruckner's best and said, "Above all, the invention shown, both in thematic lines and in wealth of development, is little less than marvelous for Bruckner was sixty years old when he began work on this symphony." It was given again in 1909 and was then

laid on the shelf until Dr. Koussevitsky revived it in 1929.

The comments of the critics were divided in regard to the Romantic Symphony and the Fifth Symphony but Mr. Hale, Mr. Downes, and Mr. Elson all agreed that the Eighth Symphony was the best one which this master had produced.

During the last season of Mr. Gericke's conductorship, in 1905 - 1906, the first and only important new work performed was Mahler's Fifth Symphony in C Sharp Minor, on Feb. 2nd, 1906. To quote Mr. Elson: "It was intensely dramatic and deeply interesting ... one of the most significant works of the present." Mr. Parker, after a careful analysis of impressions for and against, stated that it most certainly brings 'intense sensations'. This work has been repeated at least four times by the orchestra, the last time within the fifty year limit being in 1914.

Two works by César Franck appeared on the programs of the orchestra during the Debussyan period. First was his Symphony in D Minor (1886 - 1888) which was played on April 14th, 1899. The Transcript's comment was that there was evidently a great deal of true beauty, of masculine strength, and poetic imaginativeness in it. Mr. Hale did not feel able to comment upon the whole - merely on the various movements as they impressed him. He did say, however, that he wished it could be heard again before the next season; his wish came true. Mr. Elson spoke of it as one of the few really great, solid works for orchestra which have come to the world from France. The Globe critic noted its "abundance of melody and its distinct

originality in development of thematic material and possessing a wealth of artistically blended tonal color and harmonic effects quite out of the ordinary." This symphony has indeed become one of the best known and one of the best loved works of this sort and has had at least sixteen repetitions by the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

On Feb. 16th, 1900, the second composition by this master was heard. It was Les Eolides (1876). For Mr. Elson it was "one of the most logical and intelligible compositions that we have yet heard from this composer." Mr. Apthorp notes that "here is the right, the really poetic way to write a symphonic poem .... it is thoroughly charming!" And Mr. Hale called it clear, fanciful, poetic, with ingenious modulations and slight material managed with admirable skill. There have been only four repetitions of this work, the last one being in 1922.

Saint-Saëns' Third Symphony in C Minor (1886) was produced on Feb. 15th, 1901. Mr. Apthorp said in his review, "In the work itself I can as yet descry nothing but an enormous and splendidly accoutred nothing-at-all." Mr. Elson called it a powerful work and spoke of Saint-Saëns as certainly the greatest orchestral genius among living Frenchmen." But Mr. Hale, after summing up his various merits and faults, commented thus: "When you say the workmanship is excellent and the workman is amazingly clever, you have said all." As in the post-Wagnerian period, the criticisms of Saint-Saëns differed widely and the question of his ultimate importance or influence is still debatable.

Smetana's only appearance in this period was on April 24th, 1896, when his Vysehrad (1874) was performed. The Transcript spoke of it as a work not without a certain dignified beauty, if tending a little in the direction of the commonplace at times - pleasant to listen to once. Mr. Elson felt that "it requires more than one hearing in order that its full beauty may be understood." This work has, however, had five more performances since its initial production.

Ernst Dohnanyi was first represented at these concerts by his Piano Concerto in E Minor, Opus 5, (1899), played on Nov. 22nd, 1900, with th composer at the piano. To the Herald critic it was a wearying and disappointing performance. Mr. Elson remarked that this concerto "demonstrates that he has individuality in musical ideas and characteristic methods of expressing them." Mr. Hale considered it characteristic of a prize composition - and said little more. Mr. Apthorp admitted that it was an experimental, early work, but called it one of the most interesting compositions by a young man that have yet been heard here." This was the only performance of this work.

On Nov. 27th, 1903, this young man's Symphony in D Minor (1897) was performed for the first time in America - and for the first and last time in Boston. Mr. Elson remarked on his skill in orchestration but said that the "numerous ideas presented are not well digested or assimilated; the material is there, but it is not yet brought into unity or homogeneity." The other critics agreed with Mr. Elson.

Elgar's Overture, Cockaigne, was played by the orchestra on Nov. 29th, 1901, for the first time in America. Mr. Elson remarked that "the orchestration is modern and full of strong contrasts and the treatment is musicianly in the matter of development and coherency .... It is a good addition to the English repertory." Mr. Apthorp wrote: "The thing is great - particularly in its summary ending - and more need not be said."

The second item by this composer to be produced was the Enigma Variations, Opus 36, (1899), performed in Boston Dec. 24th, 1903. Mr. Hale commented on them as being well worked out. "There is often in this work a display of genuine fancy in thought and expression and there is an occasional flash of imagination." To all appearances the composition made a favorable impression on critics and audience alike. Up to 1931, however, there were only three other performances.

On Mar. 7th, 1896, a Suite, Opus 36, (1896), by Arthur Foote, was played. It was called 'well-groomed music' by the Herald. The Traveler noted that it was "a refined work of the purely classical type - it does not aim at exceeding heights, and it therefore succeeds excellently." Mr. Hale described it as a gain in facility of expression but "whether that which he has to express is worth saying is another matter." The critics' opinions were apparently justified as there has been only one repetition of this work since, in 1903.

As a matter of local interest we note the one and only

performance (conducted by the composer) of Euterpe, a concert overture by Chadwick, on April 22nd, 1904. Mr. Elson observed that it was sane, well-constructed music, not very exciting as a whole, but containing some ingenious subleties. But Philip Hale thought that this work "will not enlarge his reputation, for it is not conspicuously imaginative or brilliant." Rather "it has the character of a well made 'occasional' overture, but it is significant in that it is straight forward music."

Another work, of interest especially to Boston and vicinity, was Henry Hadley's Symphony No. 2, The Four Seasons, played for the first and last time on April 14th, 1905. The general opinion was expressed by Mr, Roy Gardner[1] who said that this composition "is entirely frank and simple, comprehensible and melodious and yet modern in spirit. Above all else it has the merit of actually saying something, in place of toying with a series of formulas."

This symphony by Hadley concludes the works by post-Wagnerians and we now turn to those composers whose works are characteristic of the second, or Debussyan, period.

First of course is Debussy himself. Three of his works were heard during these years. First was the Prélude à l'Aprés midi d'un Faune, (1892), which was played in Boston on Dec. 30th, 1904. It had been heard twice before in Boston,

---

[1] of the Boston Transcript, later of the Boston Herald

once played by the Orchestral Club under Mr. Longy and once at a Chickering Production Concert under Mr. B.J.Lang. Mr. Roy Gardner may be quoted as saying,"It is only to be hoped that the experience may soon be offered again to concert goers, for it is not every day that one can hear music of such strange fascination so exquisitely played." Mr. Elson felt that this composition contained false and hysterical ecstasy in spite of its delicate pastoral effects and the beauties of its orchestration. Admiration and liking for this work has grown as the years passed and there were ten repetitions up to 1931.

Second were the Sketches, La Mer, (1905), which were played for the first time in the United States according to Philip Hale, on March 1st, 1907. Some were more enthusiastic about this work than others but we quote Mr. Olin Downes :" Surely Debussy has never penned a more marvelous and subtle score than this, and surely he has never more successfully exercised his incredible skill in the blending of color and the use of strange, involved, or conflicting rhythms, which convey psychological suggestions and impressions in a manner only possible to this inimitable Frenchman." Within the first fifty years this was played again on nine different occasions.

Third were the Nocturnes, Clouds, Festivals, and Sirens, (1899), which appeared on the program of Dec. 11th,

1908. They were "of strange beauty and strange suggestion" to Mr. Parker. 'Imagination' and 'rare expression' were the terms applied by Mr. Hale. The *Globe* may be quoted thus : "Scored in a masterly manner, their effects are not to be denied, though many of the modulations and some of the strange commingling of instruments certainly sound harsh even in this age of musical progress." There were only two repetitions up to 1931 but these *Nocturnes* are now gratefully accepted and do not sound harsh or strange any more.

On the whole Debussy's music was well received by the critics, especially by Mr. Downes, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Hale, and Mr. Parker. At the time it must have been difficult to judge the music but their criticisms have been more than justified.

Vincent D'Indy's *Istar Variations*, Opus 42, (1897), were played on Feb. 17th, 1899. The *Advertiser* wrote that great expectations had been raised and there was no disappointment. Mr. Hale designated it as "a work of much musical interest in harmonic and orchestral treatment." "D'Indy is thoughtful, daring, and sincere."

Summer Day on the Mountain, Opus 61, (1905), by the same composer, was produced on April 24th, 1908. Mr. Parker considered it spacious, free, elastic, and eloquent... the deeper inspiration was D'Indy's own spirit, expanding and kindling under the spell of his beloved mountains of the Cevennes." Mr. Hale wrote of it, "This music is

impressionistic, and the impressionism is of the most daring nature."

The best known and probably the most popular of Dukas' compositions, The Sorcerer's Apprentice, (1897), was played on Oct. 21st, 1904. According to Mr. Hale, "Dukas has made a singularly picturesque and effective transliteration of Goethe's ballad -an excellent example of the better modern French school." This work was first heard in Paris. Taken in the jovial spirit in which it was conceived it was designated thoroughly delightful by all who heard it. It had nine repetitions within the first fifty years.

At the third concert of Mr. Fiedler's second season, on Oct. 22nd, 1909, Granville Bantock's The Pierrot of the Minute (1899 - 1900) was presented for the first time in America. Mr. Hale wrote: "There is in this music both the mysterious lull, the brooding in any great city at certain hours; there is also the din that is peculiar to Paris and its streets." Mr. Downes we quote as saying: "The workmanship is sure, the scoring ultra modern, and it is plain we have to do with an arch-impressionist." This was its first and only performance.

On Jan. 7th, 1898, Mr. C.Martin Loeffler's symphonic poem, Le Mort de Tintagiles, was played. To Mr. Elson it was "a very talented but very repellent composition .... Mr. Loeffler has already proved he is thoroughly imbued with

the ultra modern pessimism." Mr. Hale wrote that this work is "another proof of the genuine orchestral talent of this man. And yet, unless I err seriously, the piece does not mark an unmistakable advance in his musical career." But the critics of the Globe and of the Herald, on the other hand, considered it a work of 'exceptional merit' (Herald). The Transcript said that "we have heard it but once, and its whole musical atmosphere is of a sort to which it takes some time to get acclimated." It was played six more times between 1898 and 1931.

This composer's Pagan Poem, Opus 14, received its initial public performance on Nov. 22nd, 1907. Mr. Downes said much about "the distinction and originality of Mr. Loeffler's style, which, though strongly influenced by his French contemporaries, is essentially and entirely his own, and of his supreme mastery of instrumentation it is hardly necessary to speak. The new composition fairly bristles with the most remarkable instrumental devices." Mr. Hale remarked that "it is music that of itself is nobly sensuous, keenly emotional, now dolorous in grief, now irresistible in exultation."

The last composer to be considered during this Debussyan period is Jan Sibelius. He comes neither under the category of the post-Wagnerians nor of the Debussyans but must be described as an independent composer because of his absolute individuality of style.

March 11th, 1904, saw the performance of his Second Symphony (1902). Mr. Roy Gardner wrote that it was "constantly, tiresomely, monotonously sombre but the man evidently knows his business; his symphony demands respect." Mr. Hale described it as a thoughtfully considered work ... "Mr. Gericke and the orchestra did their best for Jan Sibelius but the composer should have done more." Mr. Elson found "much originality and some majesty in the symphony", but "it seemed very short-breathed and the melodic material was rather scant." He also felt that it was the right composition in the wrong place on the program. There were six repetitions of this work up to 1931, the last one in 1929.

The first really important novelty of Dr. Karl Muck's first season with the Boston Symphony Orchestra was Sibelius' Symphony No. I in E Minor (1899) which was presented on Jan. 4th, 1907. According to Mr. Elson the first and third movements were the best and he said, "We cannot pay too much tribute to Dr. Muck's careful and conscientious interpretation, for in lesser hands the work would scarcely have made any effect." According to Philip Hale, "Fortunate in his invention of themes, Sibelius impresses by his heroic treatment of them ... Seldom has modern music such a direct and overpowering speech." This work rated eight more performances during the first fifty years of concerts.

The Violin Concerto In D Minor, Opus 47, was given on April 19th, 1907. Mr. Parker characterized it as

"abrupt, stern, and passionate" and as music "of passionate struggle through the sterness and the grimness of life for the brief joy of it. And surely it is music that has made a concerto eloquent with emotion and poignant of mood as are few concertos, old or new." Audiences have heard this on three other occasions between 1907 and 1931.

On Nov. 5th, 1908, during Mr. Max Fiedler's first season with the Boston Symphony Orchestra, the last two works by Sibelius to be given during this Debussyan period were produced. One was the Spring Song, Opus 16, for orchestra. This was, according to Mr. Parker, comparatively simple of design, mood, and utterance - "it is a sad and sombre song of the spring and its mood is virtue." This was the first and only performance.

The other novelty was Finlandia , Opus 26, No. 7, for orchestra. This, to quote Mr. Parker again, "is fierce, restless music - rugged in musical form, bare and concentrated in strength and grim and gray in coloring as the rocks about him." This number was repeated four times up to 1931. It has become one of the most popular of Sibelius' compositions and is often heard at Pop concerts. It is not generally considered one of his best works,however.

Most of the critics felt that this composer's music was strange and hard to understand but all realized that there was a certain rugged individuality andstrength which places him very near the head of any list of contemporary musicians.

VII Introduction to Third Period 1910 - 1931

The composers to be discussed during this third, or Stravinskyan period, include post-Wagnerians and Debussyans as well as those men whose works are characteristic of these twenty-one years.

There are only three post-Wagnerians to be considered : Strauss, Borodin, and the American Chadwick. Other composers of this period were represented on the programs of the orchestra but their works were not new to Boston.

The Debussyans, beside Debussy himself, include: the French Schmitt, Dukas, and Ravel, Albeniz in Spain, Enesco in Roumania, Resphigi in Italy, Bantock, Bax, Holst, Vaughan Williams, and Delius in England, and Loeffler, Hill, and Griffes in America.

Stravinsky naturally heads the list of composers characteristic of this period. There are also Scriabin, Schönberg, Prokofieff, and Tcherepnin(Nikolai) in the Russian group. Milhaud, Honegger, and Roussel represent the French, Malipiero the Italian, Hindemith the German, deFalla the Spanish, Bartók the Hungarian, Lambert and Bliss the English, and Bloch, Hanson, Sessions, Copland, and Carpenter the American group.

Mention must also be made of the independent Finn, Jan Sibelius, several of whose compositions were played

between 1910 and 1931.

During the first two years of the Stravinskyan period, (1910 - 1912), Mr. Max Fiedler continued as conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

In the fall of 1912 Dr. Karl Muck returned to lead the orchestra after an abscence of four years. Mr. Hale spoke of his first concert thus : "A great audience paid him heartfelt and flattering tribute .... nor need he doubt the sincerity of this welcome!"

In March, 1918, Dr. Muck was forced to resign suddenly because of difficulties connected with the World War. His place was taken for the remainder of the season by Mr. Ernst Schmidt, who, according to all reports, rose to the occasion, and kept the standard of the orchestra up to its usual high level.

Mr. Pierre Monteux conducted the orchestra during October, 1918. He was then first French conductor of the Metropolitan Opera Co. in New York. In November of that year Mr. Henri Rabaud came from Paris to take over the conductorship. Mr. Parker wrote, "The divine fire may not have touched this conductor (Mr. Monteux) - it touches so few mortals! -but a manifold ability, intelligence, imagination, and devotion dwell in him. He possesses the true artist's mind and -what is equally essential- the true artist's conscience." Mr. Rabaud made his first bow at oneof the Cambridge concerts of the orchestra on Nov. 14th, 1918. Mr.

Downes described him as "a conductor of experience and authority, who obtains the effects he requires none the less surely despite his modest bearing and his undemonstrative manner." Mr. Rabaud led the orchestra for only one season.

Mr. Pierre Monteux returned to Boston in October, 1919, once more to donduct the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Mr. Hale may be quoted as saying: ".... nor was the unusually hearty welcome merely by way of compliment; it was spontaneous applause, a willing tribute to the indisputable talent of the leader and to the equally indisputable proficiency of the superb, unrivalled orchestra."

In the fall of 1924 Serge Koussevitsky became the conductor of this organization. Mr. Hale wrote: "He has a commanding figure and that indefinable quality known as magnetism which works its spell on orchestra and audience. He at once inspires confidence, expectation, curiosity ... It is evident that Mr. Koussevitsky is imaginative." And Mr. Parker : "In Mr. Koussevitsky by the proofs of yesterday (written after his first concert) dwell those four-fold powers which define and consummate a conductor of the first order. The ability to discover, unfold, curve and modulate the intrinsic line of the music; to weave it into pattern, by pace and rhythm to give it motion; by accent to impart it character. The ability to distribute over the surface of this pattern the harmonic and

instrumental colors which are light and shade, heat and cold, upon it. The ability to give to each piece and each composer in it his particular voice, quality, life .... And last the ability to draw from the orchestra the tone that shall bear these powers and beauties in a manifold eloquence."

VIII Third Period 1910 - 1931

The first post-Wagnerian composition to be treated in this section is the Alpine Symphony (1915) by Richard Strauss which was played on Dec. 18th, 1925. Philip Hale said in his Herald review, "The Alpine Symphony is not a masterpiece. Strauss is extraordinarily skillful in the use of an orchestra but his Alpine Symphony is a little short of Alps." Mr. Stuart Mason[1] thought that this symphony may hardly be considered worthy of its composer, nor worthy of the time and trouble expended on its performance. And Mr. Parker felt that after ten years Strauss had returned too belatedly to the composition of tone poems on the grand scale. "Even when it (the Alpine Symphony) was nearly lost in the confusions and exclusions of the German War, it was no music of good report." This work was repeated in 1926 and again in 1930 but it has never won for itself any great popularity or admiration.

In October, 1912, Dr. Muck returned to conduct the orchestra after being absent for four years. At his eighth concert on Dec. 13th, Borodin's Symphony in B Minor (1877) was produced. Unfortunately Dr. Muck was ill and the concert had to be conducted by Mr. Otto Urack. "Under these

---

[1] of the Christian Science Monitor

conditions", said Mr. Parker, "it was hard to judge a new work. Suffice it then to say that Borodin has designed, imagined, and written after the manner of his 'nationalistic' Russian brethren .... but he had much to say, unlike other of his colleagues, only he had mastered, less than some of them, the technical resources and pliancy that would give him freedom of expression." There have been four repetitions of this symphony, the last one being in 1929.

Chadwick is the last post-Wagnerian to be mentioned. His Aphrodite (1912), a symphonic fantasy, was heard on April 4th, 1913. Mr. Elson speaks of it as a "symphonic poem in modern vein and one of the most ambitious of the composer's scores .... He is the foremost figure in native composition to-day and we hold him to be the greatest composer that our country has yet produced." Mr. Downes, however, should be quoted as follows: "The pages comprising the introduction and three divisions which follow, stand among the most vital music which Mr. Chadwick has produced of late years." And Mr. Parker regretfully states, "If only, then, all the intervening music had been like this impressive beginning and that equally impressive close." This was the only performance of this fantasy to be given during the fifty year era.

On April 28th, 1916, this composer's ballade for orchestra, Tam O'Shanter, was played. It was conducted by the composer. Mr. Hale wrote, "This ballade must be ranked with Mr. Chadwick's more original and most characteristic

compositions." Mr. Elson called it "one of the most important scores in the whole American repetoire ... thoroughly dramatic, juicily humorous, and finely scored." Mr. Downes remarked that "the defects of the piece are that it remains too long, that certain instrumental effects are overworked, that the epilogue escapes the reproach of sentimentality, and of rather conventional cadences. But as a whole this is one of the most characteristic and forceful of Mr. Chadwick's compositions." It was performed once more, in 1927.

Now let us turn to the composers who first appeared in the Debussyan period but whose works extend into this Stravinskyan period. First, of course, is Debussy. His Rondes de Printemps, Images pour Orchestre, No. 3, was heard on Nov. 25th, 1910. Mr. Hale thought that this was difficult music for the score abounds in the most delicate nuances. "It is well worthy of Pelléas and the Faune, however. Mr. Elson considered it well worth repeating -soon- because of the fact that "we are not yet accustomed to the bitter-sweet of much of the flavor of this work." This entire work has received twelve subsequent performances since the one in 1910.

The Images pour Orchestre, No. 2, Iberia, (1909), was produced on April 21st, 1911. It was considered worthy of the composer of Nocturnes by Mr. Parker. He says that the design here is stouter than has sometimes been his wont and to hear it is a sort of tonal intoxication.

On Feb. 27th, 1920, Debussy's The Blessed Damozel, a lyric poem, (1888), was performed. Mr. Hale, in addition to others, remarked, "One listened with delight to Debussy's orchestra; the chorus of women was heard with pleasure; but while the Reciter and the Damozel were at work, there was consolation in the printed text." Mr. Downes wrote, "It is not the music of the late Debussy, but it is and will be for many years to come the ineffably beautiful music of a great genius -- genius which recalls the line of Edgar Lee Masters: 'Genius is wisdom and youth'." Ten years later, in 1930, there was a second performance of this work.

On the following April 17th, the Fantasy for Piano and Orchestra (1889 - 1890) was given its first performance in America. This was never played or published during Debussy's lifetime. Mr. Downes remarked, "What is interesting and rather amusing is to perceive Debussy making an attempt, at least, at classic form and symphonic working out of motives. He fails." Mr. Parker, on the other hand, calls it "far more interesting than some of his pieces of the eighties that he himself revised and sanctioned for performance .... It is a more individualized music than the setting of The Blessed Damozel or the youthful piano pieces. The texture of the whole fantasia is no small feat of technical, yet seemingly spontaneous, ingenuity..." This was the only performance of this composition between 1920 and 1931.

In general there was more real liking for and admiration of Debussy during this period than during the previous one when his style was newer and stranger. Different critics felt differently about various compositions but most of the comments were favorable.

Because it is so rarely heard we note the playing, on March 1st, 1918, of Dukas' Symphony in C Major (1896). Mr. Hale said that "its prevailing fault is dryness - dryness in thematic material and in the scholastic use of the material. There is little or nothing that can be called imaginative." Incidentally this was its sole performance.

The last French Debussyan to be considered is Ravel. Six of his compositions were played during the Stravinskyan period. First was the Suite, Ma Mère l'Oye (1908) produced on Dec. 26th, 1913. It was well received. Mr. Hale wrote :"The music is of a delightfully fantastical nature and it has a pronounced individuality as well as a most refined fancy." The good reputation of the Suite has grown consistently and it has been given six repetitions.

At the fifth concert of the following season, on Nov. 20th, 1914, the Rhapsodie Espagnole (1907) was played. Mr. Hale described it as clever - clever in rhythm and harmony, clever in the instrumentation, in the blending and contrasts of timbre, but after the first movement it is only clever."

On Nov. 1st, 1918, the Orchestral Fragments, First Series, of Daphnis et Chloë (ballet in one act), was played. Mr. Hale did not consider these fragments as interesting as those of the other suite. He said, "These are more in need of scenery and pantomine." Mr. Parker felt that this particular work needed the ballet and could not be used as orchestral music as well as could the second suite. This series received only two repetitions up to 1931 in comparison with the six repetitions given the second suite.

The Valses Nobles et Sentimentales (1911) were played for the first and only time within these fifty years on March 11th, 1921. Mr. Hale asked, "Is there not a monotony induced by constant piquancy and continual surprises? To some of us the music has the artificiality of the ballroom."

On Jan. 13th, 1922, La Valse (1922) was performed. Olin Downes asked, "Was Ravel's fantasy of the spirit of the waltz embittered by the gruesome contrast of the war? Most of the music is ugly and mannered." Mr. Philip Hale remarked,"The better measures were purely Straussian (Johann), but not of the first order." This work has become very popular, however, and has been given nine times since its initial performance.

One of Ravel's 'best sellers', The Bolero, was introduced to Boston on Dec. 6th, 1929. Like other works of this type it has been repeated only twice since at regular concerts. Mr. Hale called it "an amazing tour de force

with a stroke of genius - the unexpected fortissimo modulation near the end." Mr. Parker said, "Not skill merely, or only resource, but imagination edging close to genius, dry, and narrow, again if one likes, all wit and style, but genius none the less."

Three of Ravel's works were favorably commented upon by the majority of critics and three were adversely criticized. The latter included the Daphnis et Chloë fragments, the Valses Nobles et Sentimentales, and La Valse. The first of these is heard only rarely now but the other two receive not infrequent performances.

On Nov. 28th, 1913, Florent Schmitt's La Tragedie de Salomé was presented by the orchestra. Mr. Parker voiced the general sentiment when he said, "A composer of power .... but a composer who still has the shortcomings of such puissant imagination and voice. His self surrender to his passionate might of design and expression deprive him of discrimination and self-criticism."

Albeniz's Iberia, a suite, was given for the first and only time on Jan. 18th, 1929. Mr. Hale called it a composition which made "a deep impression " but the critics said little about it in their reviews.

On Mar. 31st, 1911, a Suite for Orchestra, Opus 9, by Georges Enesco, was produced. It was first played in Paris in 1903. It was well received by all of the critics and, as Mr. Elson wrote, "He has given here a very interesting

work without demanding a tremendous modern orchestra."

The Rhapsodie Roumaine, Opus 11, No.1, (1908), was given by the orchestra on Feb. 16th, 1912. Philip Hale felt that the themes were of little interest, the composer having presented them clothed in holiday attire, but said it was a "light-hearted piece that makes its way by its frank tunefulness, liveliness of pace, and plausibly brilliant instrumentation."

Third and last was his Symphony in E Flat Major, which was given on Oct. 23rd, 1915. Mr. Parker considered it "a piece more ample and eager in design than in the apt and persuasive definition and filling of the plan.... The impression is of the illusion of old and touching legend, remote and glamored." To Mr. Hale this is not so original or so individual a work as his Roumanian Rhapsody.

During the season of 1920 - 1921 Resphigi was first represented at these concerts. On Nov. 12th, The Fountains of Rome (1917) were performed. Mr. Hale said, "He has not been too literal or too realistic; he has heard, seen, and written as a poet enamored of his city." Mr. Parker remarked, "A more ingratiating piece than this tone poem the Symphony Concerts have not known for long. With one accord the audience rose to it."

On Jan. 9th, 1925, came his Concerto Gregoriano, for violin and orchestra, (1922). Mr. Hale called it "an

interesting work, often beautiful, at times impressive." Mr. Parker - (with his tongue in his cheek?) wrote, "Yes, indeed! Il Signore Resphigi is a composer of scholarship and imagination, taking thought, from time to time, of the music of many men... Yes, indeed! Il Signore Resphigi has gone and done it again - tuning those Gregorian chants to this concord of sweet sounds violin-like. By all means, when the music is published, cherubs' heads should deck the cover."

The Pines of Rome were first played on Feb. 12th, 1926. Philip Hale wrote, "As a whole, the composer is revealed as a supreme master of orchestral color rather than a man of fine, entrancing, impressive ideas." But Mr. Warren Storey Smith [1] felt it was "all in all a most diverting novelty that bids fair to attain to the popularity of The Fountains of Rome." It is interesting to note here that both The Fountains of Rome and The Pines of Rome received three repetitions before the end of the fiftieth season of the orchestra.

In 1930, on Jan. 24th, Roman Festivals was produced. The general sentiment was that of the Transcript review which said, "Resphigi's Festivals is orchestral sound and fury, interjected tunes and pasted labels signifying musically next to nothing."

[1] of the Boston Post

One of the compositions written especially for the fiftieth anniversary of the Boston Symphony Orchestra was Resphigi's Metamorphoseon Modi XII, Theme and Variations, which was played on Nov. 7th, 1930. The general agreement was that "there could be no glorification of what was inherently without true strength or beauty, for splendor of orchestration will not cover paucity of musical ideas." [1]

The critics all agreed that Resphigi was a master of orchestration, of tonal color and fire, but that these merits did not balance or outweigh his lack of musical ideas -too much on the surface and not enough depth of meaning.

A first performance in the United States of Bantock's Dante and Beatrice took place in Boston on Oct. 27th, 1911. The general opinion was that of Mr. Parker who said that the sound was that of orchestral rhetoric that summoned none of these esoteric visions. He also expressed the hope that "he (Bantock) may profit by his exercise when next he has more to say." This was the only performance of this work.

The Garden of Fand, by Arnold Bax, appeared on the program of April 17th, 1925. We quote Mr. Hale :"He tells it (the story) in beautiful music that needs no Baedeker; not merely literary." Stuart Mason, in the Christian Science Monitor, says, "As a whole the composition delights by reason of the delicacy of its workmanship and the surety

---

[1] Philip Hale, in the Boston Herald

with which the composer's not altogether poetical conception is realized." This was the one and only presentation of it.

The last novelty of the 1922 - 1923 season was Holst's The Planets,(1915 - 1916) , given on Jan. 26th, 1923. Mr. Hale wrote, "Holst has certainly written uncommon music, he has fancy, if not imagination ... The Planets is in many ways a remarkable work, one that should be heard again, and soon." (This was, however, the first and last performance up to 1931). Mr. Downes concluded that "the composer has a very genuine talent, an extremely well grounded technique of the orchestra, and a straightforward, sincere, nature which would express itself to more advantage in simpler ways."

Delius first appeared during this period on April 19th, 1912, when his composition In a Summer Garden was heard. Mr. Parker, for instance, wrote,"In all his music that has been played here, none has had such full and rare beauty of design and accomplishment, of mood and impression." But to Mr. Downes it was very disappointing because Delius searches hard after beauty that eludes him." Apparently others agreed with Mr. Downes for it was played only once more, in 1918.

On Hearing the First Cuckoo in Spring (1912), by the same composer, was played on Jan. 22nd, 1926. Mr. Hale called it "a pretty burst of rhetoric, but there is a quality in this music that is not soeasily defined." All agreed that if it were heard too often it would becomd dull and

monotonous. This did not occur because it was not repeated.

The last work by Delius to be discussed during this era was his Brigg Fair, on Dec. 2nd, 1910. This work did not appeal especially to Mr. Hale but Mr. Elson wrote in his review :"This has enough beautiful moments to cause it to be classed as an important work ... we think it will hold its place in the repetoire of noteworthy modern English works." It has not seemed important enough, however, to deserve another performance by the orchestra.

There was more adverse comment about Delius than favorable comment by the critics and these works are heard only very rarely to-day, at least in Boston.

Two works by Ralph Vaughan Williams were played during this Stravinskyan period. First, on Feb. 18th, 1921, was the London Symphony. Philip Hale wrote : "There is so much native vigor in this music, so much realism that is not photographic, there is so strong an appeal that chatter about the composer's technical methods, harmonic schemes, orchestral devices and inventions would be impertinent." Mr. Downes, however, said, "There is feeling and mood in this symphony which is too long and padded. At least it is music by a composer sincere and sensitive to the atmosphere of his town." This work received two further performances up to 1931.

Second was the Fantasia on a Theme by Thomas Tallis, which was played on Oct. 27th, 1922. Mr. Hale considered it impressive but said, "It would be still more

impressive if it were a little shorter." Mr. Parker remarked that here "Williams stays and muses that he may more finely chisel and glint his cameos."

As a matter of local interest we mention here the performance of Loeffler's Hora Mystica (Symphony in one movement for full orchestra and men's voices) given on March 2nd, 1917. Mr. Downes: "This work undoubtedly contains some of the noblest music Mr. Loeffler has ever penned, and it also contains wonders of workmanship." Mr. Parker wrote, "The music is written with Mr. Loeffler's habitual technical skill, felicity, and exactness, at their fullest and finest.... the qualities of workmanship that set him above other composers in the United States and beside the Europeans of the first rank. Not in all his previous work has he achieved such sustained feats of intrinsic and imaginative polyphony, devised his harmonic color with such care, subtle and vivid invention, made such artful and significant play with instrumental timbres, or held so closely, variously and persuasively to his own characteristic idiom."

The first composition by Edward Burlingame Hill to be discussed is his poem, Lilacs, Opus 33, which was played by the orchestra on April 1st, 1927. Mr. Hale said, "His poem contains pleasing lyrical ideas that grow in warmth and expression till they burst forth in sonorous emotion." And Mr. W.S.Smith remarked, "It was good indeed to learn that music may be modern and yet moving, that the simple, fundemental

things may still be convincingly expressed in tone."

In honor of the fiftieth anniversary of the orchestra, Mr. Hill composed an Ode, with the poem by Robert Hillyer (both men are professors at Harvard University), which was played on Oct. 17th, 1930. Praised but mildly Mr. Parker said, "Better outcome possibly this evening and in other commissioned pieces that are to strew the year."

We note the playing of The Pleasure Dome of Kubla Kahn, by Griffes, on Nov. 28th, 1919. Mr. Elson wrote: "There are strong dynamic contrasts but, at a single hearing, we could not clearly follow the working out of themes and figures." And Mr. Downes :"If the thematic contours of this work are notmarked by great originality, they are marked by life, by definite direction, and at least a strong intention of form. Above all there is enormous spirit and contagion in the writing."

Griffes is the last of the Debussyan composers to be mentioned in this thesis. In beginning any treatment of composers characteristic of this period we come first to Stravinsky. Eight various works by this man were played during these twenty-one years.

On Oct. 31st, 1919, his suite from l'Oiseau de Feu was presented. Mr. Hale said, "To anyone who has seen this ballet, the music in concert form, however detachable it is, is less significant." And Mr. Downes remarked, "The music without the spectacle is difficult and in many cases

disappointing. It is inextricably interwoven with color and movement on the stage." There have been five repetitions of this suite.

Fireworks, Opus 4, was given on Dec. 11th, 1914. This is admittedly an early work of no great importance.

For the first time in America, the First Suite from the ballet Pulcinella was heard on Dec. 22nd, 1922. Philip Hale wrote, "We prefer Stravinsky working his will without foreign aid, as we prefer Pergolesi's melodies when they are not tinkered." Mr. Downes admitted that he liked this music and said, "For us, it is rather obvious farce."

Le Sacre du Printemps (1912 - 1913) appeared on the program of Jan. 25th, 1924. Philip Hale was not overwhelmed by it, found "many beautiful passages in the first part", but found the second part "dull, exasperating with its succession of pauses and resumptions, its repetitions of trivial measures ..... There seems to be a paucity of invention, a lack of imagination." Mr. W.S.Smith remarked, "Only the hidebound would deny that in Le Sacre du Printemps we are confronted by the workings of an extraordinary musical personality, and of tremendous intellectual force." And Mr. Parker believed that that concert was an epoch making occasion and called this composition "a masterpiece that had altered the whole course of music in our time; that had become beacon and goal to a whole generation of composers up and down the European and American earth." The present trends of composition show that

this statement of Mr. Parker's has been more than justified. The work was repeated three times within the fifty year limit.

At the concert of Jan. 23rd, 1925, with Igor Stravinsky as soloist, and with an all-Stravinsky program - his Concerto for piano and wind orchestra (with double-basses) was played for the first time in America. It was composed in 1924. Mr. W.S.Smith remarked, "This music grips, holds, and enthralls by reason of its sheer, intellectual vigor, its sinewy strength." Mr. Hale admitted, "It is easy to recognize and admire in the concerto technical facility ... Purely aesthetic, call it sensuous or call it emotional, enjoyment was derived almost solely from the melodic section in the middle of the work." This was the sole performance of this up to 1931.

At the fourth concert of Mr. Koussevitsky's second season, on Oct. 30th, 1925, appeared Le Chant du Rossignol (1914). Mr. Hale and Mr. Parker were both very favorably impressed and wished they might hear it as a ballet. Mr. W.S.Smith wrote,"As a symphonic piece this disappoints in its lack of any clear understanding or continuity. Not on a single hearing did any of its ideas prove immediately arresting in the sense in which the themes of Le Sacre du Printemps riveted the attention even while the ear rebelled." This received one repetition, during the next season, in 1926.

Oedipus Rex was performed for the first time in America on Feb. 24th, 1928. Mr. Hale spoke thus: "To us this

work is Stravinsky's greatest work in the conception of the whole plan, in the continuity and crescendo of horrified interest, in effects of detail, in the classic simplicity of the ending." Further, as Mr. W.S.Smith said, "It must be accounted one of the more important events of the Koussevitskian regime!" This has not been performed again by the orchestra since its initial performance although it was done in Boston once during the winter of 1936.

Another of the works written for the fiftieth anniversary was the Symphony of Psalms, performed for the first time on Dec. 19th, 1930. Mr. Hale wrote of this work: "The symphony is of such importance that it demands a second hearing, one not too long deferred." It was very well spoken of by Mr. Parker but not so much so my Mr. W.S.Smith. It has been heard twice since then, in 1932 and in 1936 and each time it has been more understood and appreciated.

Disappointment was the feeling concerning the suite from l'Oiseau de Feu. Le Sacre Du Printemps aroused aroused furious controversy among critics and audiences. And sincere admiration was expressed for the Concerto, the Oedipus Rex, and the Symphony of Psalms.

Scriabin's first introduction to Boston was on Oct. 21st, 1910, when the Poème de l'Extase, Opus 54, was produced. The views of the critics differed widely in this case. Mr. Parker observed that "of all our brood of composers

none has written such music of phantasmagoria. It is not to be liked or disliked." And then we quote Mr. Elson :"It is pushing music out of its true orbit and all the tone color and all the intensity do not succeed in giving forth a work which is strikingly new or deeply impressive." This work has been heard three times since 1931, in 1932, 1933, and 1935; also five times before 1931.

Prometheus was played on March 27th, 1925, having been first produced in 1911. Mr. Hale wrote, "In some respects it is an advance on Scriabin's preceding orchestral poems. On the other hand, the music is too often diffuse and negligible. One wearies quickly of the 'mystic chord'...... One wishes a firmer continuity, fewer episodes that say little or nothing."

On Dec. 11th, 1914, the first composition by Schönberg to be heard in Boston was performed by the orchestra. It was Five Pieces for Orchestra, Opus 16. This work is outstanding among Schönberg's early compositions and was, on the whole, very favorably received by the critics. There was no repetition of this composition up to 1931 and none since then either.

Verklärte Nacht, Opus 4, (1889; later revised) by th same composer, was heard on Nov. 25th, 1921. Mr. Downes wrote, "To us who listened yesterday it is extremely beautiful and romantic music." Mr. Parker remarked, "A loftier music,

music, deeper of thought, emotion, imagery, and impression, few composers have written." It was given again in 1922 and then was laid on the shelf until presented by Dr. Koussevitsky in 1934.

The first work of Prokofieff's to be discussed in this period is the incantatioon for tenor, chorus, and orchestra, Sept, Ils Sont Sept, which was heard for the first time in America on April 23rd, 1926. It was repeated during the second half of the program. All agreed with Mr. Hale when he said, "Here is overpoweringly dramatic music that needs no scenery, no costumes, no scenic illusion, to work its tremendous spell.... To discuss the incantation ... from a purely technical standpoint would be as foolish as to analyze a tempest, to speak of thunder and lightning in only meteorological terms." Boston heard this unforgettable work again in 1927 and in 1934.

At the beginning of the next season, on Nov. 12th, 1926, the suite from the opera, The Love For Three Oranges, was given for the first time in the United States. Mr. Hale said, "To us the most original, the most imaginative, and the best equipped composer now creating music. With the hearing of each work by him, our admiration for him waxes stronger." And Mr. Parker called it "opera of wit and humor, caprice and fantasy, gaities, fooleries, graces, wherein aptness and abundance join hands to make a many-voiced music."

The Classical Symphony, Opus 25, (1916 - 1917), came to Boston on Jan. 28th, 1927. Mr. Parker said that it "is a miniature miracle of happy artifice" and Mr. Hale said of it "a delightful little work, fresh, melodious, vivacious with significant themes; masterly, not pedantic treatment of them; charming orchestration achieved by apparently simple means, but showing consummate skill." There were repetitions of this symphony in 1927, 1928, and 1932.

Last we come to his Symphony No. 4, Opus 47, written for the fiftieth anniversary. The praise of this work is lukewarm although Mr. W.S.Smith said, "The symphony if not calculated to rouse the public to frenzies of delight, is individual and musically interesting."

All of these compositions by Prokofieff were favorably reviewed by the critics and Mr. Hale, especially, felt that Prokofieff was one of the most promising of modern composers.

Only one work by Nikolai Tcherepnin was performed by the orchestra during this period. That was his Concerto for Piano and Orchestra, Opus 30, which was heard for the first and only time on Oct. 27th, 1922. Mr. Hale expressed the opinion of the majority when he wrote, "In spite of its being a prize composition, it is a virtuoso piece for pianist, orchestra, and conductor, bristling with difficulties for all of them. The more important sections are those that are purely lyrical -these have genuine emotional quality and

charm. In them is melodic individuality."

Now we come to the French representatives of the Stravinskyan period. First there is Milhaud to be considered. His Second Orchestral Suite appeared on April 22nd, 1921, for the first time in America. Incidentally this was its only performance in Boston. Mr. Hale said in part, "The objection to the suite, if the question of cacophony be waived, is that in its best estate it is characterized chiefly by cleverness, and cleverness in art is not the highest quality." Most of the critics especially criticized the cacophony.

Second there is the composer Honegger. Nov. 24th 1922, saw the first performance in America of his Horace Victorieux. Mr. Penfield Roberts [1] considered it much more substantial and effective music than the suite by Milhaud, which was the only work by a member of 'The Six' (a group of moderns in Paris) previously given at these concerts. Mr. Downes said outright, "On the whole we rather detest this music - it is for us decadent, nervously exhausted art, which causes one to wonder if it is not a spiritual aftermath of the fatigue and terror of the most atrocious of wars." It was repeated once, in 1929.

With the advent of Mr. Koussevitsky the number of new works performed was greatly increased. At his first concert, on Oct. 10th, 1924, appeared another composition by Honegger, the Pacific 231, for the first time in America.

[1] of the Boston Globe

It was composed in 1923. Most of the critics deplored the amount of noise but Mr. Parker wrote that Honegger "has added a new energy to tones. Power springs in him, imagination also, and the courage of both. Only incidentally is he 'amusant'." This work has had two other performances by the orchestra.

Another work to be written for the fiftieth anniversary was this composer's Symphony. Mr. Hale observed, "This symphony must be ranked with the best of his many orchestral works; in some respects it is the best." Mr. W.S. Smith spoke well of the first part but not of the rest - he did say, however, that "few of the many works written for this anniversary season have been so warmly received."

Honegger seems to be another of the modern writers whose music has startled and rather confused the critics although the latter admit there is much to be praised in his work.

The third Frenchman to be treated is Roussel. On Oct. 31st, 1924, his Symphony in B Flat Major was played - for the first time in America. Philip Hale we quote as saying :"This symphony, in spite of many impressive pages, is lacking in clearness of design and firmness of structure." Mr. W.S.Smith said, "No doubt for long it will be caviare to the general, yet it seemed yesterday that France has here given us another symphonic masterpiece." Mr. Parker wrote: "Three-fold, 'tho, is Monsieur Roussel's symphony, sustaining

form, substance, and progress; achieving musical invention, charging it with human emotions; sensually vestured; artfully propelled; a music at once for ear, mind, and spirit. Few symphonies in these days may give Roussel challenge." This work was not heard again within the fifty-year era nor has it been performed since, to our knowledge.

This composer's Symphony in G Minor, composed for the fiftieth anniversary, appeared on the program of Oct. 24th, 1930. Mr. Hale observed :"It bids fair to be a piece of many occasions and in this symphony there is an elasticity, a spontaneity of musical thought that many had not been able to find in the composer's previous compositions." On April 12th, 1935, there was a second performance of this work.

The only composition by the Italian Malipiero to be treated in this period is the Seven Symphonic Expressions, Le Pause del Silenzio, which was given on April 4th, 1919. Mr. Parker expressed the general sentiment when he said in his review :"He has not only imagined new musical sounds, impressive and sometimes beautiful, upon the ear; he has also devised his own means to produce them .... Malipiero's brevity is the bounty not of the economy that considered, but of the intensity that burns away. The listener cannot choose but hear ... and applaud as well." It was repeated once during the following season.

Still another of the anniversary compositions was Hindemith's Konzertmusik, for string and brass instruments, heard on April 3rd, 1931. Philip Hale - "for the most part it is worse than ugly - it is dull, nor does the display of technical ingenuity save it." Mr. Parker, however, wrote in an opposite vein and concluded by saying, "If sounds still signify, he has made music, and it is alive." Boston heard it again on Feb. 26th, 1932.

The Spanish DeFalla is first represented by Three Dances from El Sombrero de tres picos, which were played on Dec. 30th, 1921, for the first time in America. The Globe voiced the general sentiment when its critic, Penfield Roberts, wrote, "This piece is the best Spanish orchestra music yet heard in Boston, easy to like, yet not banal or crude." Mr. Downes said, "These dances heard yesterday impressed rather by their ingenuity, their appropriateness for dancing, and brilliancy of orchestration, than by latent originality." These have been repeated three times.

Nights in the Gardens of Spain, for piano and orchestra, was heard in Boston on March 28th, 1924. Philip Hale felt that DeFalla's suite was disappointing, in view of the rhapsodic praise awarded it by foreign critics. But Mr. Parker was favorably impressed and said, "He is neither academic nor impressionistic, of the oldest or of the newest fashion. Out of himself, out of Spanish store, out of the materia musica common to our time he weaves his measures ... Often it

(the mood) generates a sober beauty within and upon the music. Always grace of motion informs and animates it." This suite has been heard only once since its first performance.

On Oct. 17th, 1924, this composer's El Amor Brujo was performed for the first time in America. To Mr. Hale, "Unlike many suites derived from stage works, it is charming and engrossing as absolute music, interesting melodically, rhythmically, and by surprising color. There are exquisite episodes of a haunting nature." This has been heard twice since 1924 - and before the close of 1931.

The critics seemed to feel that DeFalla was unusually proficient in writing true Spanish music and, for the most part, their criticisms were extremely kind and favorable.

The only work by Béla Bartók to be mentioned is his Concerto, for piano and orchestra, which was heard on Feb. 17th, 1928, with the composer as soloist. All admitted it was difficult to understand. Mr. Hale remarked, "As a skillfully constructed work built out of what to our public would seem scanty, if not impossible material, the concerto deserves respect, even admiration. In a large measure it accepts structural traditions, though here and there it is rhapsodic." This was the one and only performance of this concerto up to 1931.

Constant Lambert's Rio Grande, for chorus, orchestra, and solo piano, was heard on April 24th, 1931. Mr. Hale wrote of this, "Mr. Lambert has both fancy and imagination to which he gives free reign for his orchestra and the pianist's cadenza. His extravagance and recklessness are more to be applauded than the smug, academic, conservatism of the timid, the sticklers for approved form, the writing for safety, and the approbation of any owlish professor. Seldom, in Symphony Hall, has there been so instant, spontaneous, so prolonged, so tumultuous recognition of an unfamiliar composition signed with an unfamiliar name." A second performance of this work was given on April 13th, 1934.

The second Englishman to be discussed (Lambert was the first) is Arthur Bliss, whose Color Symphony was produced for the first time in America on Dec. 28th, 1923. All the critics agreed that there is a tremendous amount of dispute about colors represented in music, but, as Mr. Parker wrote, "For many a listener Mr. Bliss' symphony was more engrossing and tingling as 'absolute' music than as any color scheme or color suggestion in tones. It spoke for itself right valiantly and -to use, for once, a hackneyed and debased word - right lovably - a composer who can write diatonic melody fresh and individual, with a contour, motion, and expanding substance all its own; yet who can strew dissonances, sharpen harmonies, flick and bite with timbres in

true modernistic fashion." This was the sole performance of this symphony as far as we can tell.

The next to the last anniversary composition to be discussed is Hanson's Romantic Symphony, No.2, which was played on Nov. 28th, 1930. Mr. Hale remarked of this work, "It is when Dr. Hanson is gently romantic that he is effective."

The first appearance of Bloch at the Symphony concerts was on March 23rd, 1917, when his Three Jewish Poems (1913) were played and conducted by the composer. Mr. Downes voiced the general opinion when he wrote: "The music of Bloch took everyone by surprise on account of its emotional depth and its novelty of color and accent ...No others (i.e. new works) have revealed as we believe these Jewish Poems reveal, a new and important figure in the modern musical art ... This music has the warmth, the melancholy, the sensuality, the prophetic fervor, of Hebraic literature. It is here at moments harsh and austere, of a passionate intensity, or it has Oriental grace and languor." These numbers have been heard on three other programs, in 1926, 1927, and 1936.

On April 29th, 1921, two poems, l'Hiver et Printemps , (1905), by this same composer, were presented by the orchestra. Mr. Downes pointed out that this is not the mature Bloch -- but it is music conspicuous for its sense of nature, for its impressionability, with the naturalness

and spontaneity with which, at least in l'Hiver, the composer finds a tonal language to express himself. So expressing himself, Bloch is much more convincing in his first piece than in his second."

John Alden Carpenter's suite, Adventures in a Perambulator, were given on Dec. 24th, 1915. Mr. Parker speaks of it as "an unusual piece for orchestra that one of the most expert, imaginative, and individual of them has written .... Admittedly the suite is a comparatively light and altogether amusing piece." Mr. Downes calls it "music well written and cleverly scored." Mr. Elson described it as "gloriously good fun and masterly music as well." This work was heard again in 1916, 1924, and 1927.

The First Symphony, by the same composer, was produced on April 19th, 1918. Mr. Hale wrote in his review: "Whether its musical contents are as ingenious and as valuable as those of the Suite is a question .... the Symphony No. I, as a whole, seems to us scrappy." Mr. Parker found much that was commendable but there was also much to criticize. He ended by saying, "In symphonic music as American composers write it, there is but one other, Mr. Loeffler, to compare with him, and he is of a world in which America is a mere accident of residence; while, to Mr. Carpenter, as this same symphony testifies, America, in its finer attributes, is inspiration." This was the only performance of this composition.

Skyscrapers was played on Dec. 9th, 1927. It was well received and Mr. Parker observed, "Mr. Carpenter has amplified and enriched American music with a temperament within and an impulse from without that none of his compeers shares. By a long shot the tabernacles of American music are neither too crowded nor too various." This was repeated in 1928 and again in 1932.

In passing we note the playing of Aaron Copland's Symphony, for Organ and Orchestra, which was given on Feb. 20th, 1925. According to Mr. Hale, "The music is definitely planned and gives proof of the composer's talent. In Mr. Copland's symphony there is much brass, there is clay; but there is also something of fine silver, if not a little gold." As for Mr. Parker, he wrote this: "Mr. Copland has written a masterpiece of logical formal construction of adroit juxtaposition and successive evolution of moods..... there remains the question of whether it was worth the doing in the terms and with the language that he uses. For in this he knows but one master - Stravinsky." This work has received one further performance, on Feb. 15th, 1935. At that time the organ was omitted from the revised score and some brass instruments were added. Mr. Moses Smith, in the Transcript, believed that "the symphony is the work of a composer who had not yet entirely found himself, yet who, at the age of twenty-four, spoke with great conviction, sincerity and authority, who spoke because he had to, not because he wanted

to, and who revealed at once a fine talent.

The Symphony in E Minor by Roger Sessions was produced for the first time anywhere on April 22nd, 1927. Mr. Hale spoke of the hisses which mingled with the applause but believed this work to be Mr. Sessions' first important composition and one which showed marked originality. To Mr. Parker it was "a new symphony that bespeaks a mind and a hand more individual and fertile than the newest generation, so far as we in America know it, has yet upturned. Pray the gods that Mr. Sessions prove not a composer of a single piece." Incidentally, this was the sole performance of this work.

The last anniversary number to be mentioned is an anonymous Overture - it turned out to be written by Dr. Koussevitsky - which was performed on Oct. 31st, 1930. As Mr. Parker wrote, "We look to the impelling will, the simple, sincere, overflowing desire that the jubilee of the orchestra should be celebrated by composition in its own house."

So we come to the end of the section concerning composers characteristic of the Stravinskyan period. There is one composer who still remains the only true independent, Jan Sibelius of Finland. Seven of his works should be considered and discussed.

First was The Swan of Tuonela, Opus 22, No. 23, which was produced on March 3rd, 1911. It was generally agreed, as as Mr. Parker put it, that "small as the piece is, it is of uncanny perfection." Mr. Hale, however, did not think so and

wrote :"The mood is at once established and an appropriately gloomy, dismal one it is. But the composer's imagination soon failed and the swan quickly becomes tiresome, a prosaic bird, whereas he might have much to tell of Death, the Slayer of heroes." There were three other performances of this, in 1914, 1917, and 1924.

On Oct. 24th, 1913, the Symphony No. 4 in A Minor, Opus 63, was performed. Mr. Elson remarked that "it is not, on the whole, a repulsive work. It has moments of greatness. It seems to be the work of a genius who has not yet found himself. He is still groping, and often ineffectually." Mr. Downes, however, spoke of it as "in certain respects the most remarkable work which has yet been produced by one of the most original and interesting composers of the present period." And Mr. Parker describes it by saying, "In fine and fearless frenzy Sibelius drives his melodies through their course - a northern Phaeton with the steeds of Apollo, but too strong and sure to be overturned." But, in spite of recording its merits, Mr. Hale wrote in his review, "To me it was a disappointment .... and the symphony suffers first of all from a monotony in mood. The melodic line drawn at length or only suggested is too often without strength or beauty." In 1914, 1917, and 1931, this work was repeated by the orchestra.

On Jan. 12th, 1917, three works by this composer were played : Pohjola's Daughter, Opus 49, The Oceanides, Opus 43, and Night Ride and Sunrise, Opus 55. Mr. Downes speaks of them all as nature pieces and distinctly impressionistic. And Mr. Parker remarked that "no one of the three lacked the Sibelian individuality of design, imagination, and procedure."

The Fifth Symphony in E Flat Major was heard on April 7th, 1922. This was first produced in 1915. Mr. Hale was not aware of immediate beauty but felt that "the symphony ... would probably grow on the hearer in power and significance with future performances." Olin Downes wrote, "This symphony is anything but weak or uninspired. If it has a principal defect it is that the composer is so absorbed in his mood that he does not always take the trouble to make his weaving clear and unmistakable to an audience." Boston audiences have had an excellent chance to become well acquainted with this symphony as it was played again in 1922, once in 1927, and twice in 1934.

The Seventh Symphony was produced on Dec. 10th, 1926. Mr. W.S.Smith wrote, "Sibelius' music speaks for itself, at times starkly and bluntly, but always with compelling force. Never, indeed, has this singular composer been more trenchant, forthright, and sincere, more impatient of mere sensuousness and eartickling and more purely the musician." The years 1931 and 1935 saw repetitions of this work.

On Nov. 9th, 1928, the Third Symphony (1907) was played. Mr. Parker expresses the view of all who had waited so long to hear this work -"it were difficult to imagine a more economical music or a music in which the means so completely and inevitably accomplishes the ends. Here Sibelius is attaining that goal of every conscious artist - the conveyance and the expression become as one body and one spirit with the idea or the mood." This work was performed again during the year 1928.

Sibelius' Sixth Symphony, Opus 104, (1923), was given in Boston on Feb. 28th, 1930. Mr. Philip Hale commented thus :"The Sixth Symphony might be considered by his many warm admirers as in the nature of an experiment - an experiment in structure, in harmonic schemes, even in orchestration. The work seems to us in thematic invention, in expositions and developments, in emotional appeals, in the employment of instruments, the weakest of his symphonies." But Mr. Parker wrote, "Sibelius' tonal narrative tells the tale of his mental and spiritual experiences in a speech of his own and in the atmosphere in which he underwent or recalls them. It is by no means certain that Sibelius' symphonies are a poetry of music as we use the word with Mozart, Schubert, Wagner, or Debussy. But they are of its most penetrating and significant prose." There was another performance of this symphony in 1930.

In comparison with the works of this composer performed during the Debussyan era, the compositions of this later period seem to be better understood and more appreciated, although there was still a wide variety of opinions expressed by the various critics concerning the merits and the faults of his workmanship. All agreed, however, that he was one of the most individual, independent composers of this or any other age.

IX Conclusion

This gives a general survey of the attitudes toward new music in Boston during the first fifty years of the Boston Symphony Orchestra as expressed by various Boston music critics. The compilation of such an amount of material leads to certain general and certain specific conclusions.

First of all let us consider the music critics. There are six men whose names belong at the head of any list of Boston music critics because of the outstanding quality of their work. They are: Mr. William F.Apthorp, Mr. Olin Downes, Mr. Louis C. Elson, Mr. Warren Storey Smith, Mr. Philip Hale, and Mr. Henry T. Parker.

Mr. William F.Apthorp's services on the Transcript covered a period of twenty-two years, (1881 - 1903). As a rule his reviews were conservative in judgment although several new works by Brahms were wholeheartedly praised in his articles, namely the Third and Fourth Symphonies, the Piano Concerto in B Flat Major, and the Variations on a Theme by Haydn. These reviews were written, incidentally, at a time when the general attitude toward this composer was one of condemnation. Mr. Apthorp's style was clear and concise in its presentation of the facts and opinions concerning the subject under discussion.

Mr. Olin Downes was the first music critic on the Boston Post and wrote for that paper for eighteen years, (1906 - 1924). His was a progressive spirit in regard to new music. His realization of the worth of many new compositions was definitely shown in his opinions concerning such works as Bruckner's Eighth Symphony, Debussy's La Mer, Schönberg's Verklärte Nacht, Bloch's Three Jewish Poems, and Sibelius' Fourth Symphony. Mr. Downes probed deeply into the music itself and described his reactions as well.

Mr. Louis C. Elson's service on the staff of the Boston Advertiser covered a period of thirty-two years, (1888 to his death in 1920). He possessed a vivid and vivacious style of writing but was apt to be conservative and slow to accept new and unfamiliar music. He did not appreciate the humor of Till Eulenspiegel's lustige Streiche (Strauss), felt that Strauss' Also Sprach Zarathustra was outrageous, and was not impressed by the Fourth Symphony or the First Symphony by Sibelius, or by Debussy's Prélude à l'Aprés midi d'un Faune. On the other hand he expressed sincere admiration for such composers as César Franck, Saint-Saëns, and George W. Chadwick.

Mr. Warren Storey Smith was assistant music critic of the Transcript from 1919 until 1924 when he replaced Mr. Olin Downes as music critic on the Boston Post. Mr. Smith is still associated with this latter newspaper. Since his reviews considered in this thesis cover a period of

only seven years it is rather difficult to determine his general feelings toward new music. In most cases, however, he was an ardent champion for modern works, works such as Resphigi's Fountains of Rome and Pines of Rome, Stravinsky's Le Sacre du Printemps and the Oedipus Rex, and Sibelius' Seventh Symphony. We find adverse criticism by him in only a few instances, such as in regard to Stravinsky's Le Chant du Rossignol and the Symphony of Psalms.

Mr. Philip Hale joined the staff of the Boston Herald in 1901, having served previously on the staffs of the Boston Home Journal, the Boston Journal, and the Boston Post. He had an especial admiration and predilection for the modern French school as is shown in his learned reviews. His style was very forceful and always interesting and his encyclopaedic knowledge and keen judgment made him one of the most distinguished American music critics. His thirty odd years of reviewing together with his program notes of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, which he edited from 1901 until 1933, have made a unique and brilliant contribution to musical literature.

Finally we come to Mr. Henry T. Parker, who was dramatic as well as music critic on the Boston Transcript from 1905 until his death in 1934. His style was of a descriptive nature and performance of the music in great detail and also discussed his opinions and reactions at length.

In doing this with an extensive vocabulary and accuracy of expression his reviews were made very impressive and alive with vitality and meaning. He was extremely cautious about judging new works after only one hearing but he was always ready and more than willing to hear new music by composers such as Debussy, Malipiero, Sibelius, Stravinsky, Roussel, Prokofieff, and Joh Alden Carpenter. By following his writings from year to year, one could obtain a vivid picture of the trends of modern music.

In regard to the conductors of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, the critics were, on the whole, kind and tolerant in their reviews. We note especially their lenient attitude toward Henri Rabaud, who conducted the orchestra for only one season. In the case of Dr. Muck's abrupt departure in March, 1918, little comment was made. The critics spoke mostly of the good work done by Mr. Ernst Schmidt who took over the conductorship of the orchestra for the remainder of that season. In one instance, however, the critics were not so tolerant. That occurred when Mr. Georg Henschel became conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra in 1881. During the first season there was a general hostility shown to the efforts of Mr. Henschel but at the end of the season and at the beginning of the next there was a very different feeling and the general tone of the reviews was quite the opposite of the ones of the previous season.

In presenting their opinions and judgment of a new work it is evident that the critics of the last ten or fifteen years have been slower to criticize the worth or lack of worth of any particular new work than were their predecessors. They have realized that two, three, or four hearings were necessary before any definite decision could be justifiable.

That brings us to a consideration of the many new compositions which have appeared on the programs from 1881 up to 1931. Some works, which at first were adversely criticized, are now accepted and are often found on contemporary symphonic programs. Other works which were at first adversely reviewed, have almost entirely disappeared from our present day repertory. Still other compositions were at first accepted by the critics but, as time went on, were gradually laid on the shelf. Finally there is a group of works which at present cannot be called either accepted or rejected. It is hard to tell whether this neglect is due to popular criticisms against these works or whether the conductor agreed with the adverse comment of the critics. In the following paragraphs I quote examples of these four types of compositions to show how opinions change with the passage of years and how it is possible to distinguish generally between the 'wheat' and the 'chaff'.

First, in order of their performance, are the compositions which were at first adversely reviewed and which were later accepted as worthwhile examples of symphonic literature. As a matter of interest I also quote the total number of performances each work has received up to 1931 :

Brahms	Academic Festival Overture	22 performances
Brahms	Second Symphony	30 performances
Bruckner	Seventh Symphony in E Major	6 performances
Brahms	Violin Concerto	20 performances
Strauss	Don Juan	15 performances
Strauss	Till Eulenspiegel's lustige Streiche	14 performances
Strauss	Also Sprach Zarathustra	9 performances
Rimsky-Korsakoff	Overture on Themes of the Russian Church	6 performances
Loeffler	Le Mort de Tintagiles	7 performances
Strauss	Don Quixote	6 performances
Strauss	Symphonia Domestica	9 performances
Sibelius	Swan of Tuonela	4 performances
Sibelius	Fourth Symphony	3 performances
Ravel	Valses Nobles et Sentimentales	1 performance
Stravinsky	l'Oiseau de Feu	6 performances
Ravel	La Valse	10 performances

Second is the list of compositions which were at first adversely criticized and which have almost entirely disappeared from contemporary programs:

Dvorak	*Symphony in D Major*	4 performances
Saint-Saëns	*Violin Concerto*	9 performances
Dvorak	*Symphony No. 4*	1 performance
Bruckner	*Romantic Symphony*	1 performance
Dohnanyi	*Piano Concerto* Opus 5	1 performance
Dohnanyi	*Symphony in D Minor*	1 performance
Chadwick	*Euterpe Overture*	1 performance
Enesco	*Symphony in E Flat Major*	1 performance
Dukas	*Symphony in C Major*	1 performance

Third are a number of more recent works which have not been repeated often enough to tell whether they will be accepted generally or eventually discarded. In regard to Scriabin's *Poème de l'Extase* and *Honegger's* *Horace Victorieux* the criticisms were both favorable and adverse. As for Resphigi's *Metamorphoseon* and *Roman Festivals* and Scriabin's *Prometheus,* the criticisms were decidedly unfavorable. The list follows :

Scriabin	*Poème de l'Extase*	6 performances
Resphigi	*Metamorphoseon* Theme and Variations	1 performance
Honegger	*Horace Victorieux*	2 performances
Resphigi	*Roman Festivals*	1 performance
Scriabin	*Prometheus*	2 performances

Fourth and last are quoted two compositions which have been discarded from the symphonic repertory which at first were favorably reviewed by the critics:

Strauss Symphony in F Minor 2 performances
Bruckner Symphony No. 5 1 performance

If we reagrd this period from 1881 to 1931 from the viewpoint of the nine conductors whose terms fall within these years - except for Koussevitsky who has continued since 1931 - it is possible to discover certain characteristics and predispositions which influenced the makeup of their programs and the results obtained from the orchestra. There is a distinct development traceable from Henschel to Koussevitsky, a development which I think all will agree is in the right direction.

Mr. Henschel was not an experienced conductbor when he took charge of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, but his enthusiasm and untiring efforts laid the foundation of the orchestra we have to-day. During his first season the critics were not favorably disposed toward his work and two of the favorite criticisms dealt with the question of 'tempo' (Mr. Elson) and with the amount of Henschel found on the programs. Since he was a warm friend and admirer of Brahms, Mr. Henschel introduced a great deal of this composer's music - at first to the disappointment and disgust of both critics and public. But his efforts were not in vain and gradually Brahms

acquired a firm foothold in the orchestra's repertory. Also during his second season the critics became much more appreciative of the results achieved by Mr. Henschel.

Mr. Gericke, the second conductor, had much experience behind him and was a capable disciplinarian and organizer. To the Herald his talent was of a very positive nature and the Journal emphasized his power to inspire the musicians. As was natural, his programs showed a predilection for and loyalty to German composers.

It was the general sentiment that the choice of Mr. Nikisch was a wise one. Mr. George L. Osgood felt that he played upon the orchestra as a genius would play upon his chosen instrument and the Transcript noted his absolute command of the orchestra. During his regime there was not so much modern music played. Because this conductor had sunch a genius for his work and because he so inspired his men the actual musicianship of the group improved although the progress of new music was not especially furthered.

The Traveler described the next conductor, Mr. Emil Paur, as modest and earnest in his bearing and the Courier spoke of his intelligence, decision, and finesse. He was entirely in favor of presenting new music, especially that of Richard Strauss. He believed in playing a good deal of the older music as well but laid more stress on the present than had Mr. Nikisch.

After Mr. Gericke's return engagement Dr. Muck

came to Boston to lead the orchestra. He had behind him an established reputation and was cordially received by critics and public alike. His dignified, sincere personality impressed Mr. Hale and Mr. Parker emphasized his quiet composure on the podium. The Globe remarked on his skill and good training and called him a most scholarly expositor of music. During his leadership no singers were permitted to transform the concerts into vocal recitals, which previously had often been the case. His programs showed a reverence for the classics and an equal enthusiasm for modern composers.

Next came Mr. Max Fiedler. For the Globe critic he was forceful but never grotesque and the Boston Post thought him enthusiastic in gestures, of much nervous force, and far less formal than Dr. Muck. During his term of leadership he greatly popularized the concerts. This is very evident if one glances through his programs and compares them with the programs of other conductors.

Following Dr. Muck's second engagement Henri Rabaud became conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra for one season. Mr. Downes noted especially his modest bearing and undemonstrative bearing and considered him a conductor of experience and authority. As a conductor Mr. Rabaud was certainly not outstanding and few new works appeared on his programs. To all appearances he was most concerned with César Franck, Saint-Saëns, Rimsky-Korsakoff, and Beethoven.

Another Frenchman was the next conductor of the orchestra - Mr. Monteux. Mr. Parker attributed to him a manifold ability, intelligence, imagination, and devotion and credited him with a true artist's mind and a true artist's conscience. In his programs he did not emphasize French composers. He did, however, present a great deal of ballet music, probably being influenced by his tour of Europe and America with the Russian Ballet. Although the number of soloists had been gradually decreasing, there were still a great many - as many as seventeen in twenty-four concerts has been recorded for this particular period.

With the advent of Dr. Koussevitsky came a distinct change. The number of soloists was greatly decreased. His programs showed an average of three new works in two programs whereas previously there had been an average of one new work in two programs. Mr. Hale, in one of his reviews, spoke of Dr. Koussevitsky's commanding figure, his personal magnetism which affected both orchestra and audience, his imagination, and his power to inspire confidence, expectation, and curiosity. This conductor also introduced the policy of having two guest conductors each season, giving the orchestra and the public a change and giving him a rest in the middle of the season. Prior to this change there had been only two guest conductors in the history of the orchestra - Bruno Walter and Georg Schnéevoigt. Otherwise on rare occasions composers such as Strauss and D'Indy had conducted their own works.

Finally, it seems as if the Boston Symphony Orchestra concerts and the reviews by the critics changed greatly in the course of the first fifty years. An ever growing spirit of tolerance and appreciation of what is new and unfamiliar, the increase in the amount of modern music performed, the difference in music criticism from reporting the facts and pronouncing judgment and analysing the music and its effect on the hearers, and the increasing hesitancy on the part of critics and public to announce a verdict after one hearing - all these are changes which accompany the trends of modern music from 1881 to 1931.

FINIS

Comprehensive Digest of the Thesis

The purpose of this thesis has been to examine the attitudes of the music critics in Boston toward new music. As the best possible source to find the music just being introduced we have taken the programs of the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

Among the critics who have written reviews quoted in this paper are William F. Apthorp of the *Boston Transcript* ; Philip Hale of the *Boston Post*, the *Boston Home Journal*, the *Journal*, and the *Boston Herald*; Olin Downes of the *Boston Post*; Warren Storey Smith, who succeeded Mr. Downes on the *Boston Post in 1924*; Louis C. Elson of the *Boston Advertiser* and Henry T. Parker of the *Boston Transcript*.

In treating the subject I have divided the span of fifty years, (1881 - 1931), into three periods. The first, or post-Wagnerian period, covers the first ten years of the orchestra's existence, from 1881 to 1891. The second, or Debussyan period, extends from 1892 to 1909. And the third, or Stravinskyan period, ranges from 1910 to 1931. Since the works of any composer are apt to continue from one period to the next these sections cannot be strictly limited. I chose to discuss the compositions by grouping them together according to composers within any period to which they belong.

At the beginning of the first period, (1881 - 1891), Wagner's life was nearly over - he died in 1883. His influence is clearly shown, however, in the works of Mahler, Bruckner, and Richard Strauss. The dominating figures of this era are Brahms and César Franck. Other composers, whose works are here discussed, are : Smetana, Dvorak, Tschaikowsky, and the Russian school of nationalists known as 'The Great Five'.

The Debussyan period, from 1892 to 1909, produced an amazing change in musical development. This change was revolutionary, not evolutionary, because the music of Debussy and those folowing him could not be analyzed by the same harmonic system used for the analysis of music by such composers as Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Brahms, etc.

The composers whose works are represented in these years are : Franck, Tschaikowsky, Bruckner, Mahler, Saint-Saëns etc Strauss, Borodin, and Chadwick, considered as post-Wagnerians; Debussy, Schmitt, Dukas, Ravel, Albeniz, Enesco, Resphigi, Bantock, Bax, Holst, Delius, Vaughan Williams, Ireland, Hill, Griffes, Loeffler, Taylor, and Sibelius who were characteristic of the period.

The third period, known as the Stravinskyan, from 1910 to 1931, included Chadwick, Borodin, and Strauss as post-Wagnerians; the Debussyans include Debussy, Schmitt, Dukas, Ravel, Albeniz, Enesco, Resphigi, Bantock, Bax, Holst, Vaughan Williams, Delius, Loeffler, Hill, and Griffes; and the Stravinskyans are Stravinsky, Scriabin, Schönberg, Prokofieff, Tcherepnin, Milhaud, Honegger, Roussel, Malipiero, Hindemith, DeFalla, Bartók, Lambert, Bliss, Bloch, Hanson, Sessions, Copland and Carpenter, and Sibelius.

Then there are nine conductors who have been at the head of the Boston Symphony Orchestra during its initial fifty years. They are : Sir Georg Henschel, 1881 - 1884; Wilhelm Gericke, 1884 - 1889; Arthur Nikisch, 1889 - 1893; Emil Paur, 1893 - 1898; Wilhelm Gericke again, 1898 - 1906; Dr. Karl Muck, 1906 - 1908; Max Fiedler, 1908 - 1912; Dr. Karl Muck again, 1912 - 1918; Henri Rabaud, 1918 - 1919; Pierre Monteux, 1919 - 1924; and Serge Koussevitsky 1924 - .

It should be noted that the orchestra was founded by Henry Lee Higginson who sustained and supported it for many years when it was struggling to its feet. Mention should also be made of the Memorial Concert for Richard Wagner on Feb. 16th, 1883, and the Memorial Concert for Johannes Brahms on April 10th, 1896.

In the first part of the Conclusion the critics were discussed. We see Mr. Apthorp's conservatism and his clear, concise style; Mr. Downes' progressive spirit in regard to new music; Mr. Elson's vivid style of writing and his slowness to accept new music; Mr. Hale's liking for the modern French school, his forceful style and keen knowledge and judgment; Mr. W.S.Smith's broad-mindedness and glad acceptance of new music; and Mr. Parker's impressionistic nature and eager acceptance of modern works.

Toward the conductors the critics were usually tolerant and favorable as in the case of Henri Rabaud, where they were possibly too lenient, and of Dr. Muck when he had

to leave in March, 1918, but they were antagonistic toward Henschel in his first season. Of late years there has been a greater tolerance toward new works and fewer hasty judgments pronounced.

Of the many compositions discussed there were some which were at first unfavorably received by the critics but which are now considered worthy of frequent performances. Other works which were also not liked have disappeared from contemporary programs. Then there are those works which proved at first to be acceptable but which have now been discarded. And last there are some compositions which, because of the lack of repetition, cannot be said to have been either accepted or rejected. These works were all listed under their proper classification and included the total number of performances each work received.

Finally there were mentioned the various conductors of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Their individual characteristics were noted and their preferences for certain composers or particular types of music.

It seems as if both the concerts by the orchestra and the reviews written by the critics have changed greatly in the first fifty years of this organization. There is an ever growing spirit of tolerance and appreciation of new music which has developed rapidly. The amount of modern music performed has increased tremendously, especially in the last

ten or fifteen years. Music Criticism has turned from reporting of facts to analysis of music and of the reaction of the listeners, and there is more and more hesitancy in condemning a new work after only one hearing.

Bibliography

1. Brown, Allen A. Scrapbook of Clippings concerning the Boston Symphony Orchestra. 1881 - 1931.

2. Chamberlin, Joseph E. The Boston Transcript A History of its First Hundred Years Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1930.

3. Dictionary of Modern Music and Musicians A. Eaglefield-Hull, Gen. Ed. London: J.M.Dent and Sons Ltd. 1924.

4. Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians H.C.Colles, Ed. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1935.

5. Howe, M.A. The Boston Symphony Orchestra 1881 - 1931 (revised and extended in collaboration with John N.Burk) Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1931.

6. Lahee, Henry C. Annals of Music in America Boston: Marshall Jones Co. 1922.

7. Local Newspaper Files 1881 - 1931 Boston Globe, Boston Herald, Boston Post, Boston Transcript, Boston Traveler, Christian Science Monitor

8. Who's Who in America Ed. by Albert N.Marquis
Chicago: A.N.Marquis Co. 1932.
Vol. 17

9. Who's Who in America Ed. by Albert N.Marquis
Chicago: A.N.Marquis Co. 1934.
Vol. 18

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02548 3514